



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





ANTIDOTE ANALYZED:

OR

A REVIEW

OF THE PAMPHLET ENTITLED

"AN ANTIDOTE FOR THE DOCTRINE OF UNIVERSAL SALVATION,

By JOHN G. STEARNS."

SHOWING

ITS DELETERIOUS EFFECTS,

AND ITS

**INADAPTATION AND INADEQUACY FOR THE CURE OF THE
SUBJECT TO WHICH IT IS APPLIED,**

IN

ELEVEN LECTURES.

TO WHICH ARE ADDED TWO OTHERS,

**SETTING FORTH, IN A CONDENSED FORM, THE PROOFS DRAWN FROM
REASON AND SCRIPTURE IN SUPPORT OF**

UNIVERSALISM,

**AND ALSO THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE, FROM THE EARLIEST
AGES TO THE PRESENT.**

BY ORRIN ROBERTS.

**"How forcible are right words! but what doth your arguing reprove?
Hear now my reasoning."—Job.**

**ROCHESTER:
PRINTED BY SHEPARD & REED.**

1848.

BX

9947

.57

R6

Entered according to act of Congress, in the year of our Lord 1948, by

ORRIN ROBERTS,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the Northern District of
New York.

TO THE READER.



To those who were not present to hear the following Lectures spoken, a few prefatory remarks may be necessary. They were spoken to a mixed congregation of Universalists, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, and others, in the village of Hemlock Lake. The circumstances which gave birth to these Lectures, are these : I had been preaching regularly for some months in the village before named, and at the close of my regular service one afternoon, I asked if some one in the congregation would give me a text which he supposed contained the strongest and clearest argument against Universalism, that I might preach upon it at my next appointment in two weeks. But no one gave me a text,

I came again in two weeks, and repeated the request with great earnestness, affirming that we were not afraid of the light, and that those who are "set for the defense of the gospel."

should be willing to let truth and error meet and grapple with each other fairly and openly, for the result would always be in favor of the truth. But no text was named. I dismissed the congregation, and coming down the desk stairs, was met by the Sexton, who in behalf of the Baptist Clergyman of the place, very politely presented to me a book of 96 pages, entitled, "An Antidote for the Doctrine of Universal Salvation, by John G. Stearns." A thought instantly occurred that this book was sent to me expressly as a text in answer to my request. I immediately called the attention of the people, and notified them that I had been very kindly favored with a text, (at the same time naming what it was,) and would commence a series of Lectures upon it, two weeks from that time. I accordingly did. Such were some of the circumstances which originated these Lectures.

They were listened to by a respectable audience with devout attention, and it is confidently believed that some good was done—that the seed sown will grow and ripen into an abundant harvest in its own proper time. They are now sent forth to the public in the hope that they may continue to do good—that the sphere of their influence being enlarged, more minds may be acted upon, and consequently many may yet be brought to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus, through their instrumentality.

They were not, when spoken, written out in full as you now find them; nor were they originally designed for publication. But having been repeatedly and urgently solicited to get them published, I have at length consented, and have now committed to

PREFACE.

Writing the whole of each Lecture, as far as I could, without regard to the precise phraseology of that portion which was spoken extemporaneously.

The "Antidote" has had a very general circulation, at least in Western New York. It has passed through a "second edition," which the author says, "has been carefully revised," and is considered by his religious friends, the Baptists and others, as one of the mightiest weapons ever wielded against Universalism. For these reasons it is thought that the cause of truth and the voice of reason demanded a candid review. Such I have attempted to give in these Lectures, which will be found to embrace arguments that cover nearly every contested point of doctrine between Universalists and Limitarians. Those arguments which have been considered unanswerable, and which are urged and repeated with the greatest vehemence, are fairly met and answered.

My object has been, not so much to show what is *not* meant, as to prove what is meant by certain scripture passages—not so much to confuse and puzzle, as to enlighten—not so much to ask questions, as to answer them, and thus leave the heart and mind improved. It has been a very general fault among controvertists or reviewers, to evade the direct point at issue, and throw dust in the eyes of their opponents, and deal largely in negative answers and puzzling queries, and thus leave their subject, rather than to give a *positive* answer, or offer an opinion of their own, that the inquiring mind might be enlightened. I have

endeavored in these lectures to entirely avoid this general fault. It is true, I have not noticed every expression, answered every question, or commented upon every passage of scripture quoted in this "Antidote," neither was it necessary. I have aimed not to leave any important point unnoticed.

To cover the whole ground of controversy, and make the Series of Lectures as complete as their limits would allow, and also to meet the wants of those who are inquiring to know more about the doctrine of Universalism, I have in the last two Lectures, presented in a condensed form the origin and history of the doctrine, and the proofs which are urged in its defense, drawn from reason and revelation. Therefore, such as they are, they are now offered to an inquiring public, by the author,

O. R.

SYNOPTICAL INDEX.

LECTURE I.

The effects of controversy stated. Christ persecuted for defending the truth. The same consequences now. Misrepresentation of our doctrine and character. Examples quoted from the pamphlet, of censorious and unkind language. Misrepresentations not made ignorantly. Both the author of the pamphlet and those who circulate it, culpable. New edition of the same pamphlet, with same misrepresentations, &c., though he says it has been carefully revised and somewhat improved. The question, "Why do Universalists take so much pains to make converts?" examined. The reason given in answer, false. The true reason given why we preach the doctrine. The doctrine of Endless Punishment, of "infinite importance," and the rejection of it followed with infinite consequences. The supposed inconsistency of our doing any thing for man's salvation, while belief or disbelief alters nothing, considered.—What the doctrine of Universalism consists in, theoretically and practically defined. Hence, the doctrine understood, all would love it, and teach it for the good of men, as we do. Adapted to man's wants—designed to work his reform, and to transform him into His own image. The object agreeing with that of the first Christian teachers, to deliver man "*from this present evil world.*" The surprise that we should teach so much goodness, if the world universally will be eventually good. If goodness hardens men's hearts and makes them careless and stupid, then God's revelation of himself is *pernicious* and Christianity a curse. The apostle's enlarged view of *God's goodness* did not make him less anxious for the moral

welfare of man. The love of God to us, the cause or ground of our love to him. The record of eternal life which is true, and the necessity of knowing that we have eternal life in Christ, since it is the true foundation of our faith in him.—Hence the apostle wrote certain fixed and immutable truths, that people sin not. What he wrote was Universalism, as shown by his language. The accusation referred to pre-supposes that we have no concern about sin, false. What we do teach transgressors. All God's attributes require obedience, and never can be satisfied with eternal disobedience...25—46

LECTURE II.

Mr. Stearns' attack on the moral character of Universalists—its unjustifiableness exposed. The advice of Dr. Blair not heeded. Our doctrine called a "delusive scheme." The charge that Universalists are not troubled about sin as others, noticed. We are charged with being notoriously wicked, and deserving the severest punishment, yet we have the least. The greatest sinners suffering the least, shown to be contrary to reason and moral philosophy. The argument that equal justice is not done on earth, examined at length, and the assertion that the daily course of Divine Providence is convincing proof that the Creator is not dealing with men here on principles of distributive justice, refuted, and shown to be at war with all revealed truth and man's duty, and if allowed would destroy all hope of perfect justice being done in heaven. The distinction between moral evil and physical evil, and moral suffering and physical suffering, shown. The apparent partiality or unequal distribution of justice in rewards and punishments made to harmonize with God's laws, and hence prove the most perfect justice in God, by giving to the virtuous and vicious each what those laws require. Charging God with injustice, less excusable in an enlightened Christian than in the untaught. The same

charge often made in prayer, unworthy of a christian as idolatry. Our duty stated. God's servants our examples. Why some men prosper and others suffer adversity. God's law impartial. All are transgressors either physically or morally. Penalty attached to physical as well as moral law, inflicted.—Impartial justice evinced in "the daily course of Divine Providence." The duty of exercising strict confidence in God's perfections, and maintaining that he will "judge the people *righteously*, and govern the nations upon earth."....47—73

LECTURE III.

The assertion "that we do not live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments," stated—shown to be contrary to fact, to reason, and to Scripture. God charged with being not exactly just with us here—placed us not under a system of impartial justice. God's system impartial, and he has no other. We live under the gospel system, which was from God, and is like his wisdom, which St. James says is "without partiality." Supposed attempt to evade the force of this reasoning, by referring to something dark and mysterious in the providence of God. The true nature of justice being guided by love, and having the same final end, not opposed to mercy. The supposed case of the highwayman who murders. The question considered whether the murderer and the murdered have equal justice meted to them. What is justice in this case? In human governments men differ with respect to what constitutes justice. This difference does not alter facts; they remain the same themselves, whether proved or disproved. Man's justice is not God's justice. The culprit may escape the former, while the latter remains true to itself and never fails to meet the transgressor. Man looketh on the outward appearance, but God on the heart, rewarding the innocent with inward peace, and afflicting the guilty with internal tortures. . . 74—91

LECTURE IV.

The case of the murderer and innocent man—"do they both meet in heaven as loving brothers?"—supposed to be impossible.—Other things equally marvelous. Paul's sudden, unexpected and unsought conversion, referred to as an example; do he and the victims of his cruelty meet as loving brothers? The grace of God made him what he was—the same grace may be applied to others as mysteriously. Different ways of applying his grace, and under different circumstances. God's grace not limited to this life any more than his love, for *death* cannot separate us from it. Mr. Stearns' language corroborating this view. Paul's testimony that grace reigns beyond death. The extent and efficiency of this grace spoken of by Dr. A. Clarke. The Dr's ecstasy while viewing this subject disconnected with his creed. If death limits the extent of grace, what become of infants, idiots, &c. The Dr's language concerning such as die in an infant state. If grace be applied to infants freely, why not to others? Mr. Stearns doubts the perfect administration of justice. Justice not overtaking the murderer. Man's justice not God's justice, which never sleeps. Doom must be met in another world, or justice falls and God is not equitable.—Strict justice not done there, but cruelty, according to his definition of punishment. Supposed great inequality in the circumstances of the two individuals here, but the inequality corrected in eternity; which shows that God's government will be changed, bettered, or improved there; and if so, why not change man and improve him, and thus correct all wrongs?—As easy to correct man as to change and improve the mode of the divine government. The supposed anomaly in the government of God over the two individuals removed, by an attempt in another part of the pamphlet to reconcile the differences in *fortune and birth, &c.*, with the impartiality of God. How *this apparent inequality is removed*—by making the inequality

infinitely greater. In this he can see full and perfect justice. The inconsistency of his theory shown by a supposed case. The pivotal point of his whole argument that sin goes unpunished in this life. Cain referred to as a refutation of this theory. His confession quoted. Extract from Tacitus. The miserable state of Nero, Herod, Agrippa, Catullus. The fear and frightful forebodings which haunt the murderer, show that justice has not fallen in sleep, but is doing her retributive work. The outward appearance of cheerfulness no true indication of inward peace. The tribunal of the conscience set up where and when the deed is committed. Sin originated in the flesh, and will be condemned in the flesh. Paul's testimony relied on, that the dead are freed from sin. Prof. Stuart's remarks. Sin cannot reign without a body of flesh and blood; such bodies not being raised, but spiritual bodies, sin cannot reign in the resurrection.—James says, "sin shall be *finished*." Anticipated objection, that if this doctrine be allowed, men may take courage to sin. Extract from Dr. Nott on the nature of vice and virtue. The true motive to obedience, love and not fear, sustained by Rev. Mr. Finney. 91—116

LECTURE V.

The supposed argument against Universalism found in God's dealings with the antediluvians, Sodomites, &c., considered. The assumption that the more wicked a man is, the sooner he gets to heaven, false and founded upon wrong views of Universalism. No man can enter heaven impure. *Reformation* is as prominent an article of our faith as salvation. The author's argument considered, which presupposes death a blessing and life a curse comparatively. The scriptural argument in opposition. The case of Epaphroditus and Lot, having mercy shown them by preserving their lives instead of destroying them. The death inflicted on the people of the old world, a judgment for

sins, while the preservation of Noah, &c., was a reward for righteousness. Scripture silence concerning any other punishment for these ancient wicked beyond their death, or any other blessing for the surviving than the preservation of life. Mr. Stearns' assumption of no change after death, and whole argument built thereupon, examined. All men universally need to be changed—those most diseased need the greater care of the physician. A contrary doctrine dishonors God. No argument to prove that God will be less kind to us in a future state than in this. We are exhorted to show mercy and compassion. And God will not violate his own precepts. Rev. A. Barnes' testimony. Eternal separation not necessary.—The blood which has been sprinkled on one heart may cleanse all. The fact of God's taking people out of the world in their sins supposed to be awful,—while the idea of his taking them into another world, and there rendering their improvement eternally impossible, is viewed with complacency and approbation. God's effecting a moral change in the sinner independent of his will, does not destroy his accountability. Death supposed to be the stopping point at which man's moral agency ceases and God's mode of government changes. The argument of God's changing man from mortality to immortality, an argument that he will also change him from moral imperfection. Scripture proof of the same, which exhibits in the most lovely light the moral beauty of God. One moment as regards the time of changing, supposed to make an eternal difference in the future. The same goodness and mercy that change men here, may change them hereafter. Mr. Stearns' admission of the fact, for God is both potent and immutable. The falsity of his assumed premises that the death of the antediluvians, &c., was a fortunate and happy release from a wearisome life, while life to the surviving righteous was an evil and a burden, illustrated by a supposed case. God took them away for their good, the fact proving that he was opposed to their wickedness and

cared for them, and in such a manner as to purify them. He aimed at no inferior good ; but like a benevolent man who steps in between two combatants to cease their quarrel, he takes from them the weapons of their rebellion. The prophecy quoted which clearly points out their future restoration. The necessity of looking upon this great catastrophe as one designed, in the wisdom of God, for a great and ultimate good to the world, morally and physically.....117—139

LECTURE VI.

The nature and object of punishment. The "Restoration scheme"—Mr. Stearns sees objections to it—his misapprehension. His views of disciplinary punishment. His supposed case of the parent's punishing his disobedient child to reform it—his reasoning shown to be conclusive against himself. Justice requires no more punishment than is necessary to produce reformation—the object being obtained, it will cease. The fact admitted by him, and yet he disconnects disciplinary punishment from God's government—maintains a *vindictive* punishment. Scripture proof that it is disciplinary—that it even delivers from hell. The sure path to heaven. Punishment supposed to be no evil, but a "great good," if it produce reformation. Sovereign remedy. God will administer the same agreeable with man's desire for restoration. Mr. S's difficulty in reconciling a fatherly discipline with the idea of indignation, wrath or curse, in the divine punishment. The question, From what is man redeemed ? answered. If man be totally depraved, *what* is saved ? What fits man for heaven ? The question answered. Punishment supposed to harden. None but endless punishment can have such tendency. The phrase, "destroyed without remedy," considered—its meaning given. The true sense given to the words, "All things work together for good," &c. *Distinction between chastisement and punishment—the*

former inflicted on God's spiritual children for their sanctification, the latter on the wicked but not for their good. The argument considered. A government sustained by a "curse," not a righteous government. Punishment that has no good end in view for the sufferer, is revenge. The sentiment of Rev. Robert Hall. The legitimate ends of punishment not produced by ceaseless pain. Christ suffered the punishment due to all—"paid the debt due to every sinner;"—the result is, justice can have no further claims, and on this hypothesis the doctrine of endless pain must fall, which is the prayer of all, angels and men. 140—158

LECTURE VII.

Forgiveness supposed to be irreconcilable with punishment. Illustration of its nature and mode of application. Scripture view. The word defined—applied to the act of sending out diseases. Punishment and forgiveness walk hand in hand, and aim at the same object. Punishment prepares the way for forgiveness to be applied. Repentance and remission of sins will be given to all. Scripture proof. Salvation from deserved punishment, not a scripture doctrine. False view of Restorationism. If punishment be pardoned it is limited, such only being the punishment deserved. The punishment of hell supposed to bring none to repentance. Why, then, teach such punishment, if it tend not to reform? "Safe to affirm that endless punishment cannot be proved." Society is safe without the doctrine. The doctrine of limited punishment established by three witnesses, viz: Robert Hall, Newton Brown, and John G. Stearns. Proved by the supposed case of the parent's punishing his disobedient child—when the object of punishment is obtained, "he lays aside the rod." The question, "What punishment does sin deserve?" answered.—*Supposed to be infinite, because sin is an offense against an*

infinite Being. The argument refuted. The argument drawn from the atonement of Christ, which is said to be infinite. The proof of its infinity drawn from the infinite dignity of Christ's character—the God-man died—expired upon the cross. Strange inconsistency, to orphanize the world to sustain a creed! The argument for the infinite demerit of sin drawn from the atonement of Christ, absurd. The infinite demerit of each sin would destroy all degrees in punishment. The design of God referred to as proof of eternal suffering. The design of God reasonable. The scripture proof that God has designed the salvation of all—that all were “given to him in an everlasting covenant.” The justice of God adduced in support of eternal punishment. Every other principle in the Divine nature opposed to such punishment, as admitted by all good men—five witnesses to one against eternal punishment. But justice does not necessarily require such. Its punishment is proof that it is opposed to sin, and therefore it must seek to overcome it and not perpetuate it. Justice rewards and punishes according to merit and demerit—should it fail, it would be injustice. But the doctrine of eternal punishment shows that it does fail, &c. A fallible justice, unsure foundation to build a doctrine upon. The horrible nature of this justice described, on which the horrible doctrine of endless pain is based. 158—182

LECTURE VIII.

Benevolence introduced as proof of endless punishment. Benevolence “a favorite topic” with Universalists—their arguments rest upon it: better foundation than cruelty. Benevolence defined. Differing conclusions from the same premises.—“The highest possible good of the moral system,” what? No comfort or satisfaction from a benevolence that inflicts immortal pain: the fact confessed by Mr. Stearns, Saurin, Dr. Dwight.

Dr. Barnes, and Llewellyn. The effects of the doctrine stated. Every being and principle of goodness opposed to it. Sin and misery here consistent with benevolence, no argument that eternal sin and misery hereafter will be. The argument that though the individual sufferer may not be benefitted by eternal suffering, yet the moral system will be, examined. Who and what receives this benefit! "The supreme felicity of the universe," the object to be promoted. This felicity, universal felicity,—each individual, therefore, composing the universe, will participate in it. The scripture contrast between the righteous and the wicked. The argument drawn from it, refuted. The parable of the sower examined—shown to relate to events in time. The man that had seven evil spirits—his last state not his future eternal state—the true sense of the passage given. The text "He that is unjust," &c., examined—its meaning given. Parallel passages quoted. "Trifle with the scriptures." The veracity of God the foundation of our confidence and hope of salvation. We believe in God's threatenings as well as in his promises. What we teach.—Unkindly accused of preaching the devil's doctrine. What the devil's doctrine is, and what its opposite. Extract from President Edwards:.....183—206

LECTURE IX.

The sin against the Holy Ghost. The reason why it will not be forgiven is solely its "*magnitude*." The scripture duty of forgiveness shown in Christ's words. God charged with positive unforgiveness, reduces him to a level with "the arch deceiver." The charge similar to that of "blasphemy" in the text. The teaching of the doctrine of eternal, unmitigated pain is the greater blasphemy; the blasphemy of the Jews referred to, no comparison in magnitude. The thought is painful that men living under the light of the Gospel should have

such unworthy views of God's character. No marvel that infidelity reigns. The meaning of the passages—that it is equivalent to saying, ye will continue to blaspheme,—such is your stubbornness that this particular sin will cling to you as long as the working of miracles shall afford you an opportunity of ascribing them to the operation of the evil one. The true sense of “forgive.” The language of Stephen—of Christ in reference to the Jews' obstinacy. Eternal damnation—its meaning—danger thereof. Christ's prayer for his murderers. The case of Peter's denial, compared with the Jews' blasphemy—the former was restored, so with the same reason will the latter be forgiven. The words, “Whither I go,” &c., uttered alike to the unbelieving Jews and the disciples. Scripture proof that the blaspheming Jews were forgiven. The prophets and apostles represent them as subjects of forgiveness. That Christ was sent to turn them away from their ungodliness, and that he will do the work, so that at last they shall all confess that Jesus Christ is Lord. The case of Judas Iscariot. Supposed to be in hell. The silence of the scriptures concerning his future state. The meaning of the phrase “hanged himself.” Examples of the same end. Died, being choked with grief. “His own place”—meaning of. Objections to the common view of “It had been good for that man,” &c.. Its proverbial meaning. Testimony of Livermore and Clarke....

207—224

LECTURE X.

The argument drawn from the resurrection. The inconsistency of calling that a *glorious* doctrine, which teaches the resurrection of some expressly for misery. The scripture doctrine of the resurrection, different from the doctrines of men. The statement of A. Barnes concerning the object of the resurrection—his view opposed. Quotation from Dr. Young. Love

is extinguished in heaven, if men are raised solely to curse and blaspheme. An inglorious, rather than bible doctrine, the foundation of eternal punishment. Paul's hope of the resurrection of the just and unjust referred to—no proof of eternal suffering. The passage in Daniel quoted. The awaking of those who were asleep in the dust of the earth, not the christian resurrection. The connexion quoted and meaning shown. "Marvel not," &c., quoted from John. Spiritual resurrection meant. Paraphrase from Cappe.—The word "graves" not understood literally, but figuratively, as in Ezekiel. "He that soweth to the flesh," &c., quoted, and its meaning explained. The order of the resurrection, supposed to be proof of eternal punishment—the argument refuted and the meaning of the apostle illustrated. The resurrection spoken of in Rev. 20th cited. 2d Peter 3: referred to—the passing away of the heavens, &c., figurative. Quotation from 2d Thess. 1: 7, 8—its true sense given. The second death, apostacy—experienced in the time of John—John saw its final destruction. The general judgment. God's judgment day the gospel day. All judgment committed to the Son. The process of judging commenced with the setting up of his kingdom and not at the close of it. God judgeth in the earth. "Appear before the judgment seat"—meaning of. The angels that were reserved in chains—meaning of the passage. Heb. 9: 27, is quoted. The common view of after-death judgment not sustained. The death not natural, but sacrificial—the judgment, that which followed the Jewish sacrifices. Rev. 20th cited—no proof of a future eternal judgment—language used figuratively. The 24th and 25th chapters of Matt. cited as proof. The things spoken of fulfilled in that generation. Quotations made at random. Exhortation to avoid the cunning craftiness of Satan, considered. Universalists use not the craft of Satan. Their purpose and hope. 224—252

LECTURE XI.

The argument stated that there is a place in which devils, &c., are now suffering. The scriptures cited, no proof of eternal punishment. David in hell, contrasted with wicked angels in hell—neither proves eternal suffering. The devil delivered from hell, and yet the state of those in hell is unalterable.—The day of judgment solemn. The universal gathering to judgment—devils meet with saints and form the procession—all fanciful. Presupposes imperfection in God's knowledge or capacity to judge. The devil's employment in hell stated. His chains—how long. The distance to hell. The devils and wicked men go immediately to hell without a trial, and come out without a trial, &c. Comparison with an earthly magistrate. The devils receive their *full* punishment after the judgment. Impossible to receive endless punishment in full. The impassable gulf made passable. The query where shall the wicked and righteous meet? The devil a witness of the truth of endless punishment—shown not to be a believer in Universalism. The parable of the rich man and Lazarus—the terms used figuratively—designed to show by contrast the state of the Jewish and Gentile people, the obstinacy and national suffering of the former, and the exaltation of the latter to greater spiritual blessings. The meaning of hell. The testimony of commentators. Eternal, everlasting, &c., introduced as proof of eternal punishment. The terms are equivocal, and therefore the proof drawn from them is uncertain. The terms applied to future misery assumed. The words endless, infinite, &c., not applied to punishment, but applied to life. The most unequivocal language not applied to punishment. If the apostles believed in endless punishment, they would have expressed it by the strongest terms. The use of *aion* by the sacred writers. The contrast between the preaching of Universalism and that of the apostles; or between the latter and Partialism. The

cases of insanity, &c., cited. The gospel produces joy, and fills the heart with hope instead of despair. The wicked supposed to relish the doctrine of Universalism—the statement not true. The worst characters said to flee to it as their only refuge. An incident. The question, does Universalism *enrage* the minds of men; considered. Cases of persecution cited.—Paul was persecuted for his belief in a universal Savior—who have been the chief persecutors since the christian era, answered—Universalists ranked with infidels. The question answered, Why were the kingdoms of the earth arrayed against Christ and his apostles. The conclusion.....252—282

LECTURE XII.

The origin and history of Universalism. First taught by God to our first parents, then by all his holy prophets, by Christ and his apostles, and after them by the most eminent fathers of the christian church, and by men eminent for their learning and piety through all subsequent ages to the present...283—310

LECTURE XIII.

Universalism embraces the following particulars:—1. A belief in one God and Jesus the Mediator—2. In the Atonement—3. In the New Birth—4. In the necessity of Repentance—5. In the scripture doctrine of Forgiveness—6. In Rewards and Punishments—7. In the Resurrection—8. In universal Holiness and Happiness.—9. THIS DOCTRINE HAS CLAIMS—first, on account of its moral tendency—second, it affords the only full satisfaction in the hour of death—third, because it only is consistent with the work of overcoming *all* evil—fourth, it is adapted to our social condition—fifth, it is destined to triumph.

310—338

LECTURE I.

INTRODUCTION.

The title of the pamphlet before me which I propose to review or analyze according to previous appointment, implies that the doctrine of Universalism is a disease, and that the people on whom it has fastened itself are sick, and in need of medicine. Wherefore this pamphlet, like a pill composed of many ingredients, is administered professedly for the cure of this disease, and is advertised to the public as, "An Antidote." And whether it be like many other humbugs in this age of "pills," and "balms," and "sovereign remedies," and "infallible curatives," or whether it will prove effectual in eradicating this deep-seated malady—this dreadful infection which has fastened itself upon so many in this age, a discriminating public will discern when they have fairly tested its properties and known its ingredients. Many learned Doctors in this and past ages, together with many humble and honest "Quacks" in theological science, have untriedly and severally put forth all their skill and talent, and taxed all their spirit-

ual pharmacology to get out some remedy, some *cura-*
tive that shall effectually remove this terrible plague
from the world, which is spreading with such fearful
rapidity over all the face of the earth. *And yet it*
rages! I have taken repeated doses of this celebrated
“Antidote,” and the dreadful disease of Universalism
still retains its firm hold upon me. I have never known
one cured by it yet, or that it ever checked the pro-
gress of the disease in any one instance. True, we
frequently hear the shout go up in one place that Uni-
versalism is fast yielding to the powerful and many An-
tidotes administered—in an other that it is “breath-
ing its last,”—in an other, that it is actually “dead,”
the scourge is removed—and that over all the country
it is fast going down to merited oblivion. But this is a
false hope—a dream of the fancy. And notwithstand-
ing all the professedly curative properties discovered in
modern theological science, are combined in this one
“Antidote,” and all the skill of spiritual physicians
has been called out to add to it the most sovereign effi-
cacy—still Universalism increases, affecting deeply
whole communities, even where the “Antidote” has
been faithfully administered. Therefore, I purpose to
analyze this “Antidote,” and show how much there is
of real value in it, and how far it is adapted to the cure
of what is supposed to be the most fatal of all the dis-
eases that infect our race, namely, Universalism.

You will bear with me while I attend to some impor-

tant preliminaries, before I enter directly and fully upon this labor before me.

To meet with an opponent and dispute with him on the various points of theology which divide community, is not always associated with pleasure, nor attended with exclusively good results. Because, let a man be ever so cautious in the choice of language, and mild in his communication, it is almost if not quite impossible to speak against another's views with the design of exposing his errors, and *not offend*. Hence I am not insensible to the fact, that in examining this pamphlet—in exposing its sophistry, correcting its misrepresentations, and exploding its errors, I may injure the feelings and increase the hostility of some who hear, notwithstanding all my best endeavors to the contrary.—For it is a trite and common saying, that “nothing cuts like the truth.” Even the meek Son of God, with all the benevolence, kindness, compassion and mildness with which his soul was inspired—even *he*, while exposing the errors of the doctrine and practices of the Jews, received renewed insult, the hostility of his enemies became increased, insomuch that they cried out, “*Crucify him, crucify him.*”

I do not expect, my hearers, to be literally “crucified before you,” but I do expect to give my body in sacrifice voluntarily for the defense and promotion of Truth's holy cause, let bigots frown, and prejudiced opposers pre-judge and condemn as their uncharitableness may

dictate. One thing I wish you to remember, and not lose sight of, while I proceed with the task before me, that it is just as unkind and unchristian for my opponent to abuse me and misrepresent my opinions, as it is for me to abuse him and misrepresent his opinions.

Feeling myself unkindly treated, and my views most grossly misrepresented by the author whose production I am about to review, you will not think it strange if I manifest much earnestness and use great plainness of speech, just as you would do if I were to treat you unkindly and misrepresent your doctrinal views. Let charity, then, measure to you the same amount of forbearance that it would measure to me.

That I may not be misunderstood, and be supposed to misjudge when I refer to the abuse and misrepresentation of this author, I will quote some of his language, found on different pages of his pamphlet. He says on page 95, "These men [viz. Universalists,] as a general thing, do not pretend to know any thing about experimental religion." Supposing I retort by saying, the Baptists, "as a general thing, do not pretend to know any thing about experimental religion." Would Mr. Stearns receive this charge kindly and as a mark of christian kindness in me? Would he not unhesitatingly pronounce it an unqualified slander? Yes, and correctly too. But the charge against us as a people, is as false and unjustifiable, as the charge against them. *Again*—on the same page, he says with unwarrantable

arrogance and assumption, that "We are sure of one thing—the Lord has never called them to administer his word and the ordinances of his house. They have no authority to pretend to preach the gospel of Christ.—They possess *not one characteristic* of ministers of the New Testament. They are ignorant of the gospel, and therefore, not qualified to teach its sacred mysteries." This is a most sweeping denunciation indeed. Supposing I should throw back this censure—this wholesale condemnation upon the head of Mr. Stearns and the whole Baptist denomination to which he belongs—would he say that I was actuated by the spirit of brotherly kindness? Would he not rather say he had received unmerited abuse, such as could not have come from a true disciple of Christ? Let him not blame us then for thinking the same of him and his censure.

He says again, "As a people they are stupid, careless, prayerless, have no fear of God before their eyes; and are ignorant of the nature of sin and of the plague of their own hearts." This partakes of the same spirit and is equally false with the foregoing. He says, that, Universalists reiterate the same falsehood taught by satan to our first parents—"the first falsehood ever uttered in the world—they deny the truth, as false teachers always do." He says they are the followers of satan; their "scheme was invented by satan," that they are falsehood-tellers, deceivers, hypocrites, wishing to "retain the name of being religious," while for the

most part they care nothing about religion. "They are a deluded people, whom the god of this world hath blinded: who are taken captive by him at his will who wrest the Scriptures unto their own destruction. And much more I might quote to the same effect, partaking of the same spirit, and all coming from a man who in the preface to his book said that "the errors of Universalism must be met with the words which the *Holy Ghost teacheth*—with the sword of the Spirit, and that "this is the weapon he intended to use in his pages." How much of the teaching of the Holy Ghost and of the Spirit, are manifest in the foregoing quotations, judge ye. It appears to me he must have possessed more of that spirit of bigotry and intolerance which was cherished by the Jews while persecuting the early christians. Concerning their conduct towards the christians, Justin Martyr, a christian writer who lived about A. D. 150, says, that, "The Jews not only *cursed* them in their synagogues, but they *sent out chosen men* from Jerusalem to *acquaint the world* and particularly the *Jews* every where, that the christians were an atheistical and wicked sect, which should be detested and abhorred by all mankind." Whether Mr. S. is one of the "chosen men sent out," for a similar work against Universalists, I leave for you to decide. One thing is certain, like the Nazarenes of old we are "*every where spoken against*." And it is equally evident that our author wishes to represent us as a ve

irreligious, "atheistical and wicked sect, which should" be detested and abhorred by all mankind."

Turning from these specimen marks of unkindness towards us as a people, I would invite your attention to some of his most glaring misrepresentations, not to say any thing of the almost countless instances of misapplication of Scripture. He says the sentiment expressed in the language of the serpent, "Ye shall not surely die," is Universalism. We deny this charge, and repel it as wholly false in all its length and breadth. We have reiterated our denial of it, times without number, both in public and in private, and still the charge is repeated every day as though no denial had ever been made.

We quote again: "Jesus says, 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' Universalists say, he shall not be damned. Jesus says, that the 'wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment.' Universalists say that they shall not go away into everlasting punishment. Jesus says, 'he that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost is in danger of eternal damnation.' Universalists say there is no such thing as eternal damnation. Jude says that the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah are 'suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.' Universalists say there is no such thing as the vengeance of eternal fire. John says, that the wicked 'shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.'

Universalists say there is no such thing as being tormented forever and ever."

In every one of these paragraphs, six in number, is contained a most palpable and flagrant misrepresentation. And shall we say it was made wilfully, or ignorantly? It must be one or the other; and if either, the author is truly reprehensible, and deserves the most pointed rebuke. And those who circulate this pamphlet knowing that these statements are misrepresentations of the sentiment we advocate, are culpable also. The sin of ignorance may be "winked at," but any man who will knowingly and wilfully circulate misrepresentations to the injury of any denomination of professing christians, is "to all intents and purposes" a deceiver, and of course an enemy to the cause of truth. If it be a fact as our opponents say, that "Universalism is so palpably erroneous that to be disbelieved, needs but to be known and understood,—why misrepresent it? why not state it just exactly as it is? that any and every child may see its naked deformity and timely escape its delusive entrappings?

Is it reasonable to suppose that the author of this pamphlet was ignorant of the sentiment of Universalism, when there is so much written and spoken in defense of it, and while there are more or less books, pamphlets and periodicals of various forms and sizes, in almost every family in the State? In view of these facts, what shall we think, what ought we to think?

that his misrepresentations are ignorantly, or wilfully made? We can hardly suppose the former, and it might be thought uncharitable to think the latter.

It is now eight or ten years at least since the first edition of this pamphlet was published; and the author must have been a very dull scholar indeed not to have seen during this time a contradiction of his statements against us: for page upon page has been written and sent over all the length and breadth of our land, to show that he has unjustly accused us; that what he has said concerning our views is entirely false: yet notwithstanding all this, and the probable fact, that in private conversation with the advocates of Universalism, he has been repeatedly told that he has grossly misrepresented our views, and done us much injustice thereby—he now, after a lapse of eight or ten years, comes out very coolly and deliberately with a “*second edition*!” Verily, what shall we think of the man’s honesty and christian candor? He says, “this second edition has been CAREFULLY REVISED, and the author hopes that it will appear to the public somewhat improved.” There is still room for a more careful revision and greater improvement.” And I would suggest that before he publishes another edition, he would “carefully” expunge from this “carefully revised! second edition,” all his errors, misstatements and gross perversions, inserting in place thereof real Universalism as taught by its public advocates, that it may in very deed

and beyond all dispute "appear to the public," not only "somewhat," but *thoroughly* "improved."

I shall now turn my attention and confine my remarks to what is contained in the first chapter of this pamphlet, though I shall not attempt to notice every thing that it contains. On the sixth page I find this oft repeated question standing out in bold relief, "Why do Universalists take so much pains to make converts? If their scheme be true, all men will be saved whether they believe it or not. Believing or disbelieving will alter nothing. Why agitate the subject? The reason they offer is, they wish others to be relieved from so much trouble about sin." Now is this fair—is this candid—is it christian like? Whom did he ever hear say that this is, "the reason we offer?" Where and when did he ever see such a statement in print? And where did he get his authority for this bold and unqualified assertion? Let his conscience answer before God.—What real Universalist ever said, or implied in any expression, or gave the remotest hint that the reason why we "agitate the subject" of Universalism, is that we wish others to be relieved from so much trouble about sin? Not one, I venture to say, among the thousands on earth. Our constant labor has been from the earliest history of the doctrine, to present before the world the true nature of sin, its heinousness in the sight of God, and the deep wretchedness which it is sure to produce in all who practice it—and thus to create a

concern about it, that they may readily flee from it as from a pestilence that spreads wasting and destruction in its course. But if on the other hand we were to advocate the views of our author, by telling the people that the consequences of sin are so trivial they are scarcely felt at all in this life, and that the wicked enjoy more happiness here than the righteous ; if we advocated such views, it might in truth be said of us, that we labored to relieve men "from so much trouble about sin."

But I will invite your attention again to the question, "Why do Universalists take so much pains to make converts?" This question is set forth under various forms, such as these :—"If Universalism is true, what is the use in preaching it? If all men are eventually to be saved, what is the use in going to meeting, building meeting houses, supporting meetings, or doing any good whatever?" The question in its first form, viz, "Why do Universalists take so much pains to make converts? if their scheme be true, all men will be saved whether they believe it or not," is based upon the supposition (a mere supposition it is) that our future destiny is made wholly dependent upon our belief in this doctrine or that. We find that this is the view of our author. For in the preface to his pamphlet he says, "the doctrine [of endless punishment] is of infinite importance, and should be clearly understood by every creature under heaven. A mistake here may be atten-

ded with the *most fatal results.*" Now the *most fatal*, must be those which cannot be exceeded, and consequently they must be endless. And if the doctrine "is of *infinite* importance," then a belief therein will be followed with infinite consequences. Hence if the argument has any force in it, then a man by believing in this doctrine will be rewarded with endless felicity, while the man who disbelieves it will be denied this reward. This argues that all the heathen and Mahometan world inclusive are entitled to this reward, for they cherish and maintain most ardently a belief in this doctrine, together with a great number in christian lands. But the argument, if true, would deprive the far greater portion of the *christian* world even, of the reward of endless felicity, for there is an *immense* majority in christian communities who either secretly or openly reject the doctrine, having no confidence in its truth. Does our author believe that none but those who believe in "the doctrine of endless punishment," will eventually be saved? He has more than implied this, as I have shown. For he would have us understand that *Universalists* dying in the belief of their doctrine cannot be saved, because they have rejected this "doctrine of infinite importance," and consequently "a *mistake* here may be attended with the *most fatal results.*"

The question we are now considering and the language immediately following it, were uttered in view of *the supposed fact, that we labor to make converts to our*

faith that they may *consequently* be hereafter happy, while "*believing or disbelieving will alter nothing.*"

Let me now present before you the truth upon this subject, in its clearest light and naked simplicity. In order to come at our subject fairly and understandingly, it will be necessary for me first of all to state briefly what the doctrine we advocate is.

First. This doctrine *theoretically* consists in a belief in one God, who is the Father of us all, who is the self-existent, uncreated, independent ruler and governor of the universe, "who is over all, God blessed forever."

Second. It consists in a belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Savior of the world—that "he gave himself a ransom for all," and "is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but also for the sins of the whole world;" that "he was manifested to take away our sins," and will not fail nor be discouraged, till the work is done, for "he shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied;" that "there was given to him a kingdom" in which he shall reign until "all things are subdued unto him, and God shall be all in all."

Third. That salvation consists in being delivered from the love and practice of sin, to the love and practice of holiness in the sight of God. It maintains that every man shall be "rewarded according to his works," that "he who doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong that he hath done," while "great peace have they who

love the law of the Lord ;" finally, that no one can be happy here or hereafter without true holiness of heart, and strict conformity to the law of God.

Hence, *fourth*, it consists *practically* in loving God with all the heart and our neighbor as ourselves—in doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with God—in “adorning the doctrine of God our Savior by well ordered lives and godly conversation—in overcoming evil with good, hatred with love, severity with kindness—in a word, in imitating God in the universality of his love, in the boundlessness of his compassion, in the tenderness of his mercy, and the fatherly kindness of his nature. This is in brief, *theoretically*, and *practically*, Universalism.

Really, in view of this doctrine as thus described, I am astonished that any man in candor should inquire why Universalists take so much pains to propagate this sentiment and make converts. If I have stated to you the truth, as we believe it, and God knows I have, could you really have any objection if the whole world was converted to it? And if you really and from your very heart believed the doctrine as we do, and had the same view of it which we have, would you not be as earnestly engaged, and take as much pains as we, to make converts? Indeed you would, and in your labor God would be glorified, angels would rejoice, and truth would triumph, though bigotry might knit her brow with indignant frowns, and seek to thwart your well

meant endeavors. The truth is, and it is undeniable, that many in attempting to oppose Universalism, oppose—they know not what. Their objections are not founded in matters of fact, but in mere conjecture. And what is worse, they are *determined* to be ignorant.

I will now present before you the reason, or the object which we have in advocating and striving to propagate this doctrine among men, and thus answer the question under consideration. We believe most firmly that Universalism as just presented in an epitomized form, is the truth of God, confirmed to us by every blade of grass that grows, by every orb that shines, and every word that speaks in the Oracles of God; and being his truth, is incomparatively valuable, compatible with man's wants, and adapted to his condition as a social, moral, religious, and accountable being.

We advocate this doctrine, not because we expect a belief in it will change a man's future condition, or earn for him the bliss of heaven; not because we believe it is the foundation on which alone rests our eternal all—but because it is calculated and designed to affect man's condition here, by opening to him right views of his Maker, and thereby lead him to love God ardently, serve him supremely and obey him faithfully, for this is the whole duty of man.

When Christ came into our world, he saw that gross moral darkness every where reigned. All had gone out of the way and were enslaved in error's chain.

He and his disciples began to instruct the ignorant to give light to those who were in darkness, to plant their feet in the paths of righteousness, and break the chains from error's captives, that they might bring them back to God, from whom they had wandered.

Hence, as the object of Christ's labors and the teaching of the gospel were for the purpose of instructing man, of giving him better views of his Maker, of reforming him and making his moral condition upon the earth better and happier; so we labor for the same object. Paul says, speaking of Christ, "Who gave himself for our sins that he might deliver us from this *present evil world*." It was "*this present evil world*," or world of present evil, from which Christ came to deliver us. And there is nothing said about a deliverance from a future *evil* world, for the future is nowhere represented as being an *evil* world, but the "*present*" is. Hence it was from a present evil world Christ came to deliver men. He came where evil was, and where it originated, and came to take away *present* evil, *real* evil, evil that *now* exists and *now* afflicts our race; the same as a physician, who would go where his patient *was*, and apply his medicine *where* the disease is *located*. Here is where moral sickness rages, where the skill of the great Physician is needed, and where his medicines were to be administered. In conformity, therefore, to the great and excellent pattern before us, *we labor for the moral health of the present evil*

world. If any are following the paths of vice and ungodliness, walking in opposition to God's holy law; we, by instructing them in the gospel, would point out to them the ways of virtue and holiness, beseeching and entreating them by the mercies of God to walk therein. Are any ignorant of God's character and requirements (and we believe there are many,) we wish to enlighten their understandings and convert them to a knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus. Are any without hope and without God in the world, we would labor to give them faith and hope—faith in God as their Father, and hope in his salvation as their Redeemer. Are there any mourning and disconsolate, to whom futurity affords no bright and cheering prospects and in whose bosoms no hope is implanted of a happy re-union with the dearly loved and departed, but upon whose mind broods continually, with blighting, withering power, the prospect of untold and inconceivable agonies? Oh, to such unfortunates we would come with feelings of deepest commiseration and drop a tear of sympathy and regret, pouring in the wine and oil of gospel consolation, and say to them, "*Hope thou in God,*" for "neither life, nor death, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor heighth, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

It seems to our opposers strange that we should advo-

cate the doctrine we believe, if all men are eventually through the grace of God to be made holy and happy. If it be true, they can see no need of preaching. But we happen to think differently. We advocate this doctrine because we believe it is true, and because when received into the heart, will exert a happy and reforming influence. Why, says one, if all men are to be saved eventually, it is no matter what they do; they are just as well off with their unbelief as with their belief, with their sinful practices as with holiness. If they are to be saved, they will be saved, no matter what their faith or character is. Do those who raise this oft repeated, puerile and silly objection, realize the full force and bearing of it? Do they not see that they insult the Majesty of Heaven by it, and "do despite unto the spirit of grace?" As well might one say, God has been so unspeakably good and kind, in securing the best possible blessing to me, it is no matter how much I insult his name, how maliciously I oppose him, and how wilfully I trample his law under my feet. If it is a *truth* that God is so good to me, I will exert all my energies in devising mischief, and practicing evil against him. Nothing shall be too bad for my hands to perform or too vile for my mouth to utter.

Would this be the natural tendency of such truth? If so, then it was an evil for God to make a revelation of his goodness to man at all. If the more a man saw of the goodness of God in his purpose towards him, the

more he would be induced to hate God, and array himself in opposition to him, then the whole system of christianity is false and pernicious, and all that has been revealed of God's goodness has been a curse rather than a blessing to the world. But is it so? By no means. When the apostles were converted, did they not see more in God to love and adore, and were not their conceptions of his goodness and tender love enlarged? Most certainly. But did they become more evil in consequence? Did they find new encouragement to sin? It is consummate folly, and blind or wilful misrepresentation to say that Universalism naturally encourages evil, and that those who cherish it are made by it to feel that it is no matter what they do; it is just as well to be vicious as virtuous. Did the certainty of future endless happiness and the boundless love of God as displayed in the salvation of a world make the apostles any less anxious for the moral welfare of men while upon earth? Notwithstanding the apostle felt sure of his own salvation and that God would overrule the evils of the present life for good, yet to the question "shall we do evil that good may come?" he replies, "God forbid." Again he says, "I therefore run, not *as uncertainly*." He was sure to obtain the crown laid up for him, yet he did not feel the less anxious to do good while he lived. It was a *certain* rather than an *uncertain* truth which made the apostle *what he was* and *all that he was* in the cause of God and of humanity.

The great fundamental principle of the gospel in ~~in~~ducing good actions, is contained in these words: "~~We~~ love him BECAUSE he first loved us." As children love their parents because their parents love them; so we love God because he first loved us. His love to us is the first moving cause of our love to him. It was a truth then that God loved us when we were dead in sins; and we proclaim this truth fearless of evil consequences.

Again, John speaks of a certain record, which record was true; "and this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son. These things," says he, "have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life, and that ye may believe on the name of the Son of God." Here was an immutable truth which the apostle inculcated, that the people might know it and consequently have some ground or reason for believing "on the name of the Son of God." Again he says, "My little children, these things write I unto you that ye sin not." What did he write? The truth of Universalism, viz. that "God is love"—that "We have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world;" that "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world"—that he is the "The Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." These things the apostle has written, and written that men "*sin not.*" Hence *instead of Universalism being very licentious in the mind*

of this apostle, he wrote it to restrain men from sinning. He has no where told us that he had seen and testified to the endless wrath of God and the ceaseless miseries of hell, and had written his views concerning this wrath and this hell that people might not sin. And the only reason we have to give is, that he never saw this wrath and this hell, and therefore he could not testify of them. But he had seen the *love* of God, and that he had sent his Son to be the Savior of the world: to these facts he bore faithful testimony.

The same object, therefore, the apostle had in teaching the doctrine of Universalism, that we have, namely, to advance the happiness and moral well being of those who receive it, and not as our author says, that we "might release men from so much trouble about sin." This declaration presupposes that we as a people have no concern about sin and wish not to have any—that we would give ourselves no trouble about it, or lift a finger to remove it, but would say to men, go on, take your fill of sin, let your consciences cease to be troubled about it in any manner. But I tell you, before God the searcher of all hearts, that there is not a word of truth in all this. It is a slanderous and most injurious accusation. And we pray God to forgive those who have made it, and that they may cease to "bear false witness against their neighbor." Our constant entreaty ever has been and ever shall be while there is wickedness upon earth—"Let the wicked forsake his

way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts ; and **Yet** him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him ; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." We have ever taught and still teach that the love, mercy, goodness, justice, holiness and righteousness of God, require our obedience; and as they are immutable, they can never require any thing else. "The love of God can never be satisfied with our hatred—mercy, with our sufferings—goodness, with our evil—holiness, with our sin, nor righteousness with our unrighteousness." Hence it follows that these attributes "will never be satisfied with either endless suffering, or with endless disobedience." Consequently what is so consistent with reason, so in harmony with scripture truth, we should gratefully and reverently cherish. And in reference to this fact, let us pronounce an earnest—Amen.

LECTURE II.

I commence this lecture by noticing Mr. Stearns' attack on the moral character of Universalists. I noticed in my former lecture some of his accusations against us, impugning our motives, traducing our moral character, and reducing us to a level with the most hypocritical, licentious and dangerous people on earth. I now will ask, (what reason and charity demand,) that you duly consider, before we proceed further with our examination, whether this is commendable, for a man professing the religion of Jesus, to traduce and vilify the character of his religious opponent? In attacking *error* earnestly and in a christian spirit, I can see nothing wrong, but much to commend. But there is something mean and despicable, and so considered by every one in community, for a man to attack *character*.—Shakspeare says, "He who filches from me my good name, robs me of that which not enriches him but makes me poor indeed."

It seems to be a sentiment, almost if not quite universal in community, that a man should "speak not, rather than speak ill," and that "detraction is a sin against justice." What virtuous man does not shun

the tale-bearer ? Who does not condemn the practice of the man who is always finding fault with his neighbors, and speaking ill of them ? The practice is low, mean, despicable, whether indulged in against individuals, or a whole fraternity of christian believers. Indeed it seems uncalculably worse for a man to deal in detraction against a whole christian denomination, than it does for him to do the same against a few of his neighbors. The sin is as much greater as the number is greater whom he slanders, or of whom he speaks ill. There is not one here within the sound of my voice, but who condemns the practice of the man who is constantly attacking the character of his neighbors, and speaking ill of them. But while you condemn his practice, will you applaud a similar practice in the man who stands up to minister at the sacred altar, and who should be a pattern to his flock ? Again, supposing the man in humble life, not being content merely with injuring and bringing into disrepute the character of his neighbor by the word of mouth, should sit down deliberately and write specifically his charges against the immoral character of his neighbors, and publish them in pamphlet form to distribute to the world ? Would you say he was a just man ; that he was worthy of your imitation, and merited your applause ? Would not the whole community rise en masse with righteous indignation against the man who should be guilty of such an act ? Surely. Supposing a man in this neighborhood

should issue from the press a tract in which he sets forth the character of his neighbors as exceedingly corrupt, and states that they are hypocrites, lovers of falsehood, profane, irreligious, scoffers at religion, speaking evil of the truth, "a deluded people," followers of satan, &c., Would you not consider his conduct most infamous and abhorrent? Why, your indignation would be raised to that pitch that some of you perhaps would be for lynching him forthwith. You would not bear such abuse without some kind of redress. Such, my hearers, would be your feelings towards a private individual who was your neighbor.

But, supposing a minister of the gospel should come out in the public prints thus rashly, upon the character of a whole religious denomination, would your feelings be less wounded? Because he done this thing under the garb of religion, is he less culpable? and does it extenuate his fault, or soften down an otherwise wrong act into one of virtue, so that you would now rather applaud than condemn? How is this? let an impartial jury answer. Because he stands ensconced behind the sacred desk and wraps himself in a mantle of religious profession, does this screen him from public censure and condemnation? And may he commit an act with impunity which if another private member of society committed, he would be publicly condemned for and execrated? Alas! how much partiality there is in this world!—how much leaning to one side exclusively

to the abandonment of even-handed equity! And ~~the~~ omnipotent are the customs and habits of society!!

But it so happens that in this land of liberty, the accused has the privilege of answering for himself, speaking in his own defense. I am grateful for this privilege, which I enjoy before you this evening. I ~~am~~ the accused. My character has been assailed and slandered; not mine individually it is true, but mine in connexion with that of my brethren in the faith. I care not how earnestly a man attacks my faith, and strives to expose its errors, if errors there be in it. But when a man assails my moral *character*, and calumniates that, he has descended from the high dignity and calling of a gospel teacher, and must expect to be sharply rebuked, because I look upon it as a direct injury to me. Supposing all that is said or intimated in this pamphlet against the character of Universalists as a people, should be strictly believed by all the people in this village. And supposing you should see me, with the certain knowledge that I was one of that people, passing your streets; you would say, as Mr. Stearns has said of us, there goes a man who "denies the truth, as false teachers always do;" he "does not pretend to know any thing about experimental religion;" he "has no authority to pretend to preach the gospel of Christ;" he possesses not *one* characteristic of ministers of the New Testament;" he is a deluded man; he "*brings all his forces into the field to engage in a quarrel with*

christianity. This is his life. Nothing is more gratifying to him. The most vicious men on earth have no controversy with his system. The drunkard, the gambler, the profane man, the thief and the murderer," who are his companions, "flee to it as their only refuge." He casts the law of God from him, which is the rule of moral action, and does not acknowledge it as a rule of duty binding on him as well as on all others.—He is in fact *a deceiver and a dangerous man.*

I ask, then, in the face of sober sense, if these sayings were believed by you in reference to me, and surely our author wrote his book to be believed, would they not tend to injure me as a man and as an individual?—Who among you would trust me with your goods, or entrust any thing to my care? Who would invite me to your houses to share in your hospitalities? or to mingle in the circle of your families; where I would have an opportunity of instructing and advising your children? Not one of you perhaps, sincerely believing this report of me. You would shun me as you would a viper, and I should be left to suffer in your streets; left without the consolations of your sympathy, or a practical exhibition of your charity.

So far then as such a report would have a tendency to weaken your confidence in my moral integrity and uprightness, or increase your prejudice against me just so far it injures me. And how much such an accuser must answer for, and how extensively the injury

inflicted is felt, God only knows. How careful should we be when we attack *character*, for it is a man's life and living. A man might as well steal my purse as to rob me of my character by false accusation. When a man attacks the creed or religious opinion of another, the results are widely different. When a man's opinions are exposed and his errors exploded, the community will feel to treat him with marked kindness and sympathy, for his misfortune in choosing error rather than truth, and they will have no less confidence in him because he maintained that error in sincerity.

How much better then it would have been for our author—how much more honorable in the sight of men and promotive of peace and harmony, had he confined his attack to the doctrinal *opinions* of his opponents, rather than to go so much out of the path of the christian as to traduce, vilify, misrepresent and rashly assail the moral character of a respectable denomination of professing christians. But he has merited for himself lasting disgrace, and a peace-loving, discriminating community will be sure to award him his due. He has not earned one jewel for vital christianity, but has plucked many from his own brow which might have remained there gracing and adorning it, even long after his tongue that spoke had been hushed in silence, and his hand that wrote had been palsied with death.

Had he devoted all his labor to the exposing of the *errors of our faith*, and let our moral character alone,

he would have acted more in conformity with the dictates of christian charity.

And had he read and heeded the excellent advice of Dr. Blair, he would have done himself much honor. The Dr. speaking of candor, and of the candid man, remarked, "How much soever he may blame the principles of any sect or party, he never confounds, under one general censure, all who belong to that party or sect. He charges them not with such consequences of their tenets, as they refuse and disavow.— From one wrong opinion, he does not infer the subversion of all sound principles; nor from one bad action, conclude that all regard to conscience is overthrown. When he beholds a mote in his brother's eye, he remembers 'the beam in his own.' He commiserates human frailty; and judges of others according to the principles by which he would think it reasonable that they should judge of him. In a word, he views men and actions in the clear sunshine of charity and good nature; and not in that dark and sullen shade which jealousy and party spirit throw over all characters."

The excellent sentiment inculcated in these remarks, I wish to be governed by in my examination of the pamphlet before me.

Without further preliminaries, I shall commence noticing some of the most interesting portions of the first chapter, entitled, "The punishment of sin not

confined to this life ;" and answer the Universalism, while I shall correct some of misrepresentations. On page 6 and 7 we read it is true, that many of those who fall in a delusive scheme, are not troubled about sin as other people are." Here, unkindly and *unjustly* too, I call this doctrine a "delusive scheme."

To delude, is to cheat or deceive. How, then, could the doctrine ever cheated or deceived any one? It offers joys to the believer which cannot be taken away so that the believer is unhappy and dissatisfied in his belief! When it asserts in the language of the Bible, that all things shall be reconciled unto Christ, and the last enemy shall be destroyed, will I say, Paul! this is a delusive scheme, an invention for some will remain eternally in a state of probation; and enemies to Christ and his truth will still exist. When John asserts the approach of the Millennium when "there shall be no more death, neither crying, neither any more pain;" will I say, John! this is all a delusion; for death, sorrow, and crying, and pain shall continue to the end of time. But we will let this unkind speech pass for the present, and proceed to notice the other passage of scripture quoted, viz: that Universalists are troubled about sin as other people are. This was noticed at some length in my former. *It may not be altogether useless to give it a*

tice now. What is meant here by not being troubled? Is it meant that we throw off all restraint, and care nothing about the prevalence of sin; that if we sin, or if others do, it gives us no trouble, for we had just as lieve see a man living in sin and rebellion against God, as to see him a meek and humble follower of Christ? This must be the meaning of the expression; and if so, I hesitated not to pronounce it a base and wilful slander, refuted both by the teachings and practice of all true believers in the doctrine we advocate. So that any man who is the least discerning and will take any pains to inform himself, will justify me in the charge just made. So I pass to consider the language in immediate connexion, found on page 7. He says; "as I have already remarked, some of them are notoriously wicked; and of all men living, deserve the severest punishment—the greatest share of trouble in this life. Yet they evidently have the least." There is an approach towards the truth in the first sentence quoted, where we read, "some of them, [Universalists] are notoriously wicked." I would alter the language a little, so that it would read, "some of those who *profess* to be Universalists are notoriously wicked." This expresses a plain and undeniable truth—a "notorious" fact. But I suppose what may be said of us may be said of all denominations. There are some in each, who "are notoriously wicked." But neither I, nor the doctrine I advocate, is responsible for all the "no-

torious" wickedness that may be found among the careless, ignorant, reckless professors of the doctrine.

But I am surprised to find such a notorious untruth in the latter clause of the language quoted, viz : that these "notoriously wicked Universalists deserve the severest punishment of all men living, and the greatest share of trouble in this life; yet they evidently have the least." This is a declaration conveying a sentiment at variance with scripture truth, with reason with moral philosophy, and all human experience from the days of Adam down to the present, viz : that the "most wicked who deserve the severest punishment and the greatest trouble, have the least." Did any man ever learn this doctrine from the scriptures, that sin produced happiness, and holiness misery ? that the *greater* the sin, the *less* the punishment ? Will our author say that he himself enjoys less than the most abandoned and profligate of earth, and on the score of happiness he would prefer to exchange states with him ?—What a sentiment to inculcate before the sinner, and what discouragement to be righteous ! And yet on page 21, our author says ; "The sufferings of the wicked, as a general thing, are not as severe nor so protracted, as those of the righteous." Let us view this subject philosophically, or in the light of moral science. For I find that our author bases his whole argument of future punishment on the supposition that *equal justice is not done to the righteous and to the sin*

ner in this life. And he employs about 20 pages of his pamphlet to show that God does not deal with them in this life on the principle of equal justice: the righteous are made to suffer too much, and the sinner too little; but in the future state this inequality will be corrected; the righteous will be repaid for all their sufferings here by an addition of happiness, and the sinner will be made more miserable for his deficiency of suffering here, until his measure is full; so that the sufferings of the righteous here will merit for them greater happiness hereafter, and the enjoyments of the sinner here, will merit for him greater misery hereafter. This is all hypothetical, fanciful, visionary, and unsupported by reason and moral philosophy. But if this hypothesis is not true, our author can see no justice in God's moral government of the world as at present administered. Indeed, he says on page 10, "the daily course of Divine Providence with which all are familiar, is convincing evidence that the moral Governor of the world is not dealing with us in the present life on principles of distributive justice." Was there ever an assertion which approached nearer to that of direct blasphemy? Verily, the expression chills my blood!! How awful, *inexpressibly* awful, that a man professing to be spiritually enlightened, and to be a teacher of God's truth, should stand up before the public and speak, either from the sacred desk, or through the press declaring that the moral Governor of the world is

not dealing with us in the present life on principles of distributive justice!

I am astonished beyond measure, especially when I think that such a dishonorable view of God is taught before and urged upon the youth and rising generation. But I thank God that light is advancing—that the time is approaching and now is, when such pernicious and unworthy views of God and his dealings, will be exploded as relics of the dark ages. Our author is at least one hundred years behind the age in which we live, and his philosophy will ere long be universally looked upon as the offspring of a weak, ignorant, and degenerate mind. If it be true as our author says, that God does not deal with us in the present life on the principle of justice, it might be asked what assurance have we that he ever will deal with us on the principle of justice? If God is immutable as all christians admit, then it follows as an undeniable fact that if he does not deal justly with his creatures here in this world, he will not deal justly with us in any other world. This is a conclusion to which we are forced by the premises laid down by my opponent. His premises are opposed not only to God, but also stand in direct opposition to the holiest injunctions of heaven. We are required to be god-like—to be imitators of God as dear children; and if God does not act on the principle of justice in *his* dealings with *us*, then we are justified in not dealing justly with our *fellow beings*. And besides, what means that declara-

tion of the prophet, dictated by the spirit of the living God: "He hath shewed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of *thee*, but to do *justly* and to love *mercy*, and to walk humbly with thy God?" Here the prophet declares that God has shown us what is good. He has set us the pattern—given us the example, and now requires us to follow it by "doing justly." The requirement is reasonable, and its reasonableness is based upon the fact that *God does justly*, by us. And here I might dismiss this part of my subject, as enough has been said to convince any man who will be convinced, that the premises and conclusions of our author are utterly and entirely false; but as there are other points which these premises involve, I must ask your indulgence while I extend my remarks.

Our author seems throughout his book to make no distinction between moral and physical suffering, or between that anguish of mind for a known violation of a moral law, and physical suffering, arising from an infraction of a physical law. And on this account his mind became confused and bewildered, and was led into many errors, even to the charging of God with injustice.

He judged of rewards and punishments by outward appearances and external circumstances, and hence his mind too readily came to the conclusion that as the righteous endure much misery in this life, and the most abandoned sinner apparently enjoys much happi-

ness, God does not deal with them on the principle of strict justice, and his ways are unequal. But "who art thou, O man, that judgest?" "Ye say, the way of the Lord is not equal. Hear now, O house of Israel; is not my way equal? are not your ways unequal?" How careful then, should we be, not to indulge this spirit of fault finding which preyed upon the house of Israel, and to charge God with an unequal distribution of justice. When we judge from appearances we are apt to judge unjustly, and this is true of our author. When we attempt to scan the ways and works of Deity, we must take an extended view of things; grasp the whole world of mind and matter, view minutely every link in the great chain of causes and effects, and reason from cause to effect, as well as from effect to cause.

Even our author himself has stated, what may appear very contradictory to his other remarks quoted, that, "If it be true that the great God is dealing with us according to principles of distributive justice, crime and suffering must always go hand in hand—one immediately follow the other; and virtue and happiness must likewise exist in the same intimate relation.—The wicked must be as miserable as they are sinful; and the righteous as happy as they are holy." But does he believe this is the fact? No; and hence denies that God does deal with men on the principle of *distributive justice*. But I had rather believe this fact,

(which the scriptures teach and reason sanctions,) than to charge my God with injustice as this author does.— Would it not be more consistent and more in accordance with the meek and submissive spirit of Christ, to acknowledge that we erred in our judgment of the ways and means of God's government, than to accuse God of injustice? Let me be guilty of any error, my hearers, rather than to have it in my heart to say, that God does not deal justly by me or any of his children on earth. Let me rather say *my ways* are unequal, while God's ways are equal, and that I have erred in judgment, rather than that God has disrobed himself of justice. For every precept of the gospel and every commandment of God is founded upon the fact that vice yields misery, while virtue produces happiness, and that moral suffering always and inseparably goes hand in hand with sin, and moral happiness with virtue.— Hence it was said to our first earthly parent, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt *surely* die." Here was a *surely*, not an uncertainty. It was as sure as that God was true, that in the very day, in the season of transgression, quick as the thunder follows the lightning's vivid flash, he should be rewarded. And I am not informed that God has ever spoken any contrary sentiment to any transgressor since his day. What was true of Adam is true of every transgressor. And what God spoke to him he speaks to all his children without exception, for the principles and modes of

God's moral government are the same now that they were then, and the same moral and physical laws exist now that existed then. And did not God deal with Adam and his immediate posterity upon the "principles of distributive justice?" Who dare assert that he did not? If he did (and it would be impious to deny the fact,) then we have the best of reasons for believing that God is strictly just yet, for he is unchangeable and "governs not by partial but by general laws."

He has instituted a code of laws adapted to us as moral and physical beings, and to each of these laws he has attached a penalty. If I thrust my hand into the fire, I must be burned; if I expose my body to intense cold, I must suffer; if I eat too much, or use improper diet, I must suffer disease. These are the results of an infraction of the physical and organic laws. So equally true is it with me as a moral being. If I violate the dictates of Conscientiousness, Benevolence and Veneration, I must reap my reward, for God is no less in the moral than in the physical world, and the violation of his moral laws, he will as surely follow with their appropriate moral suffering, as he will visit the violator of his physical laws with physical suffering.

"Each object and being of nature, physical and animal," says Combe in his moral philosophy, "has received a definite constitution; and while the circumstances in which it is placed continue unchanged, it acts

invariably according to the laws of that constitution.—The supposed anomalies in the divine government are apparent only, and form no exception to the Creator's attribute of justice, when properly understood."

Because the virtuous man is afflicted with much bodily pain and disease, and suffers the loss of his children and his property, while the morally vicious man knows nothing of such losses and afflictions by experience, these facts are not irreconcilable with the justice of God. For the losses and afflictions of the virtuous man were independent of his moral action, and were consequences of physical laws. "It still remains quite true, that those whom God loveth he chasteneth;" because all the punishments inflicted for the breach of his laws are instituted in love, to induce us to obey them for our own good: but we escape from the contradiction of believing that he sometimes shows his love by *punishing* men who *obey* his laws; which would be the case if he afflicted good men by bad health, or by the death of their children, merely as trials and chastisements, independently of their having infringed the laws of their organic constitution."* And yet my opponent maintains the sentiment which I am here opposing, and hence he charges God with injustice. He assumes the position, that the virtuous man's sufferings, are not the result of an infringement of some organic or physical laws. By studying the natural laws of God and the

* Combe.

relation of things, it will be found that there is justice in God, and no lack of justice in his dealing with his creatures.

There are some who act very inconsistently to their own faith. Many "religious persons who implicitly believe that disease is sent as a chastisement or punishment for sin, will not hesitate to send for a physician and pay him a large fee to deliver a laborer, though a very vicious man, "from this spiritual discipline." Thus they would counteract the operations of justice.

Let them learn to attribute physical diseases to physical causes, and make a distinction between physical and moral laws, as our Creator evidently has made. Let them not consider the *moral* transgressor the physical transgressor in the universe, nor absolve the innocent, from all physical wrong—and all the apparent discrepancies in God's moral government will disappear.

But says one, God does not punish men according to their sins in this life, for the vicious often prosper in this world more than the righteous, and live in wealth and affluence, while the righteous live in poverty, and disease, all their days; and hence God does not deal with men in this life on the principle of justice, for justice would exonerate the righteous from all suffering, and inflict it alone upon the vicious. *But this again shows a most palpable misunderstanding.*

of the nature of the laws in the divine government.— To meet this objection I will inquire in the language of another :*—“ If God has created a world in which justice is not accomplished, by what analogy or on what grounds, do we infer that any other world of his creation will be free from this imperfection.” Mr. Stearns would say, that, “ *because* God has *not* executed complete justice here, he must intend to do so hereafter, as justice is one of his attributes.” But how does he know that it is one of his attributes ? If he concedes as he has done “ that justice is not accomplished in the administration of God’s works, the legitimate inference is that justice is *not* one of his attributes.”

Hence his theory would banish justice from the universe, and the only foundation on which he rests his faith in the doctrine of future endless suffering would be overthrown. Hence also his theory refutes itself. For if, as he says, justice requires our endless damnation, and God is now administering a government in which justice is *not done*, what valid reason have we to believe that justice will be done hereafter ? None at all. Hence taking our author upon his own ground and reasoning from his own premises, we have nothing to fear in the doctrine of infinite pain, for it is a mere pigment of the fancy. He has reasoned himself out of reason into unreasonableness as regards the ways of

* Robert Forsyth. See Combe’s Moral Philosophy.

Providence. Besides, when he says, "*Because* has not executed complete justice here, he must intend to do so hereafter," what evidence has he that he do so, or that he *intends* to do so? None whatever. It is a most fallacious assumption, without any foundation or support either in reason, nature or revelation.

My conclusion would be that if God did not deal justly with his creatures here, we had good reason to believe that he did not intend to deal justly by them hereafter.

This is the conclusion to which I would come, and to my mind it is the only sound conclusion which can be drawn from the premises. Does our author reason concerning man, as he does concerning God? Does he argue from the fact, that because a man deals unjustly to-day, he intends to deal justly to-morrow?—Does he take man's *evil* intentions to-day, as a proof of his *good* intentions to-morrow? Surely he would not reason in this way if he was possessed of a sane mind. But this is the point and pith of his reasoning, when speaking in relation to God. He says, page 10th, "The daily course of divine Providence, is a convincing evidence that the moral Governor of the world is not dealing with us in the present life, on principles of distributive justice." And from this fact he argues that God intends to and will in the future life, deal with men on principles of distributive justice. This is the *great pivotal point* upon which turns the whole argu-

ment of my opponent in support of his doctrine of future eternal punishment. I wish to put the soundness of this argument to the test.

If God be not just here, or exercises a government in which justice is not accomplished, have we any natural and logical ground for inferring that he will be just in the world to come?

But for argument's sake, we will grant that our author's reasoning and conclusion are correct. Since God does not deal with the *righteous* here on the principle of justice in punishing them according to their deserts, he will punish them hereafter. And as they *justly deserve*, on account of their own sins, to be eternally punished, they must have their *just deserts*; and since they do not have them here, they must hereafter. This is the conclusion to which we are inevitably drawn by the mode of argument he has employed.

But, it is no pleasing task, I will assure you, my hearers, to be arguing with an opponent who denies that God deals with men on the principles of strict justice in this life. There is something poisonous in the thought; something chilling to my sensibility, that men professing to be teachers of God, should present before men such dishonorable views of their Maker.

This noted error of charging God with injustice might appear more excusable in an unenlightened heathen,—in one who had not the light of science or of revelation to guide him into the path of truth; but in

the professed christian who has had or might have all the aid of revealed truth and moral science, error appears altogether inexcusable. How often my heart been pained, and my feelings shocked hearing *even in the prayer of the devout worshiper* the expression which involves God in the charge of injustice. No expression is more common than "Lord, if thou hadst been just, we should now been lifting up our eyes in torment and wailing the damned in hell." What is this but charging with injustice? It is bad enough for a man to *protest and write* that God is unjust, but for him to kneel before his Maker, and in the devout exercise of prayer *liberately charge him with injustice*, is inexpressibly impious. Pray to an unjust God! What better than idolatry? My heart's desire is that my feelings may never again be shocked by hearing the magnificent Author of our being charged with injustice—the charge may never again fall from the lips of man.

We are exhorted by every principle of morality, by every thing sacred and divine, to use our best exertions to do away with those low and groveling conceptions of the divine character—to lead man to revere his Maker for his inflexible justice, illimitable greatness, and imperishable truth, never fearing that we will have too exalted conceptions of the perfection of the divine government. Therefore, let us ever

to his confessed and truth-guided servants, the apostles, for examples in faith, in doctrine, in purity; breathing forth, with all fervency of spirit, the prayer of the apostle, "*just and true are thy ways, thou king of saints.*"

It may be thought strange that God deals equally just by the saint who is sunk in adversity, and the sinner who prospers in his way. But why does the former suffer adversity, and the latter prosper? I answer:—Because God is true to the integrity of his government, by inflicting a just penalty upon the one for a *violation* of a physical law, and bringing a reward upon the other for *obedience* to a physical law. Effects always have their causes, and they are either immediate or remote.

The reason why we sometimes see the morally good man sunk in adversity, is, some physical law has been disobeyed, and he now suffers the just penalty of that disobedience. The reason why the morally wicked man prospers in his way, that is, enjoys worldly prosperity, is, because he has obeyed those rules or laws which the other has infringed. He may be a greater transgressor of the moral law than the other man, but not so great a transgressor of the physical laws. I trust our author has never looked upon this subject in the true light of science. He seems not to make any distinction between moral and physical law, and between moral and physical effect. He confounds them.

and hence concludes that God does not deal impartially just with men upon the earth. If he will to this subject as he ought, and view the concatenation of causes and effects as discovered to us in "the course of divine Providence," he will discover most gracious beneficence and impartial justice, &c. he now thinks he discovers unequal justice or none at all. Were God to punish the moral transgressor, and let him who transgresses the physical escape with impunity, he would surely be partial and unjust. Every act has its appropriate reward. Hence the very fact itself that the morally just man suffers adversity, and the immoral enjoys worldly prosperity is conclusive proof, that God is impartially just.

Says Combe, "We have no authority for supposing that Providence, by afflicting a just man, intends only to try his faith or patience, to wean him from the world, or to give occasion for recompensing him after for his suffering; nor for believing that the unjust man is permitted to flourish, with a view of aggravating his guilt by adding ingratitude for such blessing to his other iniquities, in order to augment his punishment in a future life." For such views would be derogatory to the character of God. If we view God and his government as we ought, we shall see in the results to which I have adverted, "simply the consequences of obedience and disobedience to the law promulgated by the Creator on our constitution. It is

irrational to suppose that God will hereafter reward good men for the sufferings which they bring upon themselves by neglecting to study and observe his own injunctions ;” and equally irrational would it be to suppose that God would hereafter punish the bad man for the enjoyments he experiences here, resulting from an observance of his laws. We must remember that there is no man so just but that he transgresses in some way ; and no man so unholy but that he obeys in some form, the laws of his Maker. Each experiences results correspondent with the nature of the previous act ; for the good man does not suffer without a cause, neither does the morally bad man enjoy without a cause.

You will remember the language of our Saviour on a certain occasion : “ Think ye that those on whom the tower in Siloam fell, were *sinners* above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem ? ” This language implies that those on whom the tower fell were not sinners—that this calamity happened independently of moral action. The cause of that fall is not stated. But it is very probable to suppose that had those on whom the tower fell studied and observed the laws of nature, they might have escaped, unharmed by this destructive event.—Many afflictive and calamitous events happen in life in consequence of not heeding the laws of the physical objects around us.

It is a solemn and undeniable fact, that we are all transgressors, either of the physical and organic, or

moral law, or all. And as God is the author of them all, he will hold us accountable for a violation of either, for he has attached to each a penalty, so that no man can transgress with impunity. If any man is to be punished in another mode of being for his moral wrongs here, then he must also be punished for his physical wrongs, else there is comparatively no value attached to physical law. I hold it as a self-evident fact that vastly more of the misery and wretchedness in the world arise from *physical* than from *moral* transgression.

And while there is much said about moral transgression and its infinite and future consequences, there is comparatively little said about physical transgression, and nothing about its future results. Now a man may obey the moral law perfectly, but at the same time be a flagrant transgressor of a physical law. But because this man is *morally* upright, will God permit him to transgress his *physical* laws with impunity? No: and this accounts for the difference in the outward prosperity of the two classes referred to, and shows not only that God is just, but that he is impartial also. How absolutely false, therefore, is the declaration, that,—
 “The daily course of divine Providence, is convincing evidence that the moral Governor of the world is not dealing with us in the present life on principles of distributive justice!” We cease to wonder that wickedness prevails in the world, while such irreverent and

unworthy views of God are cherished among men.—Are we as pupils in the school of Christ, taught to look out upon “the daily course of divine Providence,” to learn that the Author of our being is both partial and unjust in his government over “us in the present life?” Has our clerical author been in the school of Christ all his days, and learned no better things than this concerning God and his government? And is he divinely commissioned to go himself, or send his book out into the world to call the attention of men to “the course of divine Providence,” as containing “convincing evidence” that God does not deal with men in the present life on the principle of equal justice? Were the disciples commissioned thus to preach? No, no: it would be the worst slander ever cast upon the disciples, to charge them with preaching thus. Had they done so, they would have directly aided the cause of infidelity more than all things else, and driven man farther and farther from God, as many are this day.

Banished from the mind, then, be such unworthy views of God. And let this truth be engraven upon our hearts, “Thou shalt judge the people *righteously*, and govern the nations upon earth.”

In my next, I shall commence by remarking upon the assertion, “that we do not live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments.”

LECTURE III.

I commence my lecture this evening agreeable with the notice given at the close of my last, by making some remarks upon that very singular passage found on the tenth page of this pamphlet, "*that we do not live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments.*" I would say in reply, if we do not, it is no matter as regards this life, how we live. We can transgress with impunity, and all distinction between virtue and vice is obliterated, the two principles are confounded, and if there is no "*reward*" for virtue nor "*punishment*" for vice, there is no encouragement to pursue the former, nor admonition to forsake the latter. For says our author, (and I quote him for proof upon this point,) "*we do not live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments.*" This assertion is contradicted by the daily experience of every man, and by the united voice of scripture, and is so palpably absurd that it seems almost entirely useless to spend any time in controverting it. Nevertheless, as I commenced this course with the design of making a thorough work of it, you will bear with me while I make a few more remarks.

Those of you who heard my remarks in my last upon the subject of laws and penalties, cannot help seeing the utter groundlessness of our author's statement. *Does not the virtuous man reap a reward for his virtu-*

our deeds? Hear what the scripture saith, "In keeping the commandments, there is great reward!"—"But whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed." John says, "blessed are they that do his commandments." These passages all show that we "live under a dispensation of rewards." And now I will show by the same authority that we live also under a dispensation of punishments, though this will seem to be a work of supererogation. If it is proved that we live under a dispensation of rewards, then the latter position is proved. For it would seem inconsistent and contrary to known facts for God to reward virtue and neglect to punish vice. Hear what the scripture saith: "Though hand join in hand, the wicked shall not be unpunished." "Is not destruction to the wicked? and a strange punishment to the workers of iniquity?" "There is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity may hide themselves." "Verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth." The scriptures are full upon this point. These passages are enough: I need quote no more. Again: it is evident from other facts that we live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments. We live under the dispensation of the gospel. For "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ." Cannot the virtuous be rewarded and the vicious punished under a dispensation

of grace and truth? Christ said, "for judgment am I come into this world." This world. He came to establish a kingdom. That kingdom was established. Did we ever know—did we ever hear of a kingdom being established in which there was neither rewards nor punishments?

The language we are considering is an insult to common sense. It contains a javelin which was aimed, though unintentionally, at the very vitals of christianity, but which falls upon our author's own head with deadliest force. He has vanquished himself. I will therefore leave him a prisoner, while I attack another sort of his erecting. He says, were he [God] to "render to us according to our deeds, according to that which we have done, whether it be good or bad," he would place us under a system of impartial justice, and proceed against us in exact observance of its unyielding principles." Well, does not God proceed against us in exact observance of its unyielding principles? Who is there so impious, so heaven-daring as to affirm that he does not? We do believe most sacredly that God proceeds against the sinner in *exact observance* of the unyielding principles of justice. Yes, in *exact observance*, without any swerving or deviation.

Who denies it?—what christian dare deny it? Is there a christian here—one who professes to love God and his holy cause: Let me say to you; do you believe God is not *exact* in his observance of the princi-

ples of justice? You *do not believe it! any one of you!* If you did, how could you love God or love his cause, if it is not exactly just? I trust you have more correct and reverential views of your Maker, every one of you. If our *author* has not, I would entreat him (for the sake of saving what little credit he has got,) not to open his mouth again as an instructor of the people, for he needs first to be instructed himself. It is strange that a man will waste his time and talent in laboring to create in the mind low and narrow views of God's character; to lessen down exalted conceptions of the divine perfections—yea even to lead men to deny that God is “exact” and undeviating in the administration of his justice. I am astonished, *astonished*, beyond measure.

But we will notice another phrase in connexion with the one under review. It is this:—“Were God to render to us according to our deeds, &c. he would place us under a system of impartial justice.” Well, has he not? I would like to know under what system the all wise Father of the Universe would or could place us but that of impartial justice? Would it be one of partial, and of course, *imperfect justice*? So our author would reason. For in his view God does not render to us according to our deeds, and hence he is induced to charge God with partiality,—with placing us under a system of partial justice. Do we not live under the system of the gospel and a system

under which God himself has placed us? This system was from above, and had its origin in the wisdom of God. And St. James says, "the wisdom that is from above—is without partiality."

We have proved, then, that inasmuch as we live under the gospel, God has placed us under a system of impartial justice; and therefore we have proved upon our author's own ground that God renders to us according to our deeds. You will mark what he says, "Were God to render to us according to our deeds, &c. he would place us under a system of impartial justice."—We have proved beyond the possibility of refutation, that we *do* live under such a system, and of course, according to our author, God renders to us according to our deeds. Let him now not complain because I have taken him by the hand and led him onward in the path of truth. I would help any man out of error's dark way, especially when he had put me in possession of the means of doing it.

But I am aware that he may equivocate and strive to evade the force of these remarks, by referring us to some dark dispensation of providence—to the child that is born idiotic, or blind, or without the faculty of speech or hearing. But I am not to be moved from my position "though the heavens should fall," that God has placed us under a system of impartial justice. This *being* an immutable truth, I will not give it up or *exchange it* for something dark and mysterious in the

providence of God. I would rather retain that, that I might be enabled to solve that which was dark and mysterious, than to take the dark and mysterious to oppose God's truth. This is our citadel, this our strong fort; if this fail, all is gone, we have nowhere to flee for safety; all is chaos and confusion.— But if we remain in it, though clouds and darkness may be round about us, yet out of them a voice speaks confirmatory, “Be still, and know that I am God.”

Our experience will enable us say, “happy the man who sees a God employed in all the good and ill that chequer life;” that he is impartially just; that though clouds and darkness are round about him, yet “*justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne.*” By the light of his truth which he has revealed, and by which we are to walk, we may be enabled to see that “all partial evil is universal good, all discord, harmony not understood;” and be enabled also to trace many of those evils which to the untaught mind may appear dark and inscrutable, back to some remote physical cause. So that instead of charging God with being the direct cause of the physical evils which afflict our race, we should attribute them more properly to man as a physical transgressor.

Our author refers us to the apparent unequal distribution of justice in the sufferings and enjoyments of men, to show that the transgressor is not punished, or the obedient rewarded in this life, and that we do not

live "under a system of impartial justice." But what does this all avail? Does it prove, as he would contend, that God is unjust and partial? Does it not rather prove that man is an imperfect being and liable to err in *judgment* as well as action, while "God's ways are not our ways, nor his thoughts our thoughts?"—While I believe that justice is an attribute of God, I shall believe that he doeth justly—that if he is impartial, he has placed us under a system of impartial justice—that if he is good, he will do good—if he is lovely, he will not "*bring upon man more than right,*" as the scriptures testify. And that he is just, impartial, good, and lovely, nature and revelation alike testify. Nor would I deny the position, for all the creeds and metaphysical reasoning in the universe. I would not throw aside one plain and established truth, and let that which is dark and inscrutable in the ways of Providence, lead me to charge my heavenly Father with injustice and partiality. "Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities," said an apostle. "And not only so, but we glory in tribulations also, knowing that tribulation worketh patience," &c. And again he inquires. Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay," answers the apostle. And again we read, "though he slay me, yet will I trust in him. It is good for me that

"I have been afflicted." The Lord will not bring upon man more than right."

These expressions all show the views which God's ancient servants entertained concerning the divine character and government. And why should not his servants now entertain the same views? Why charge God with injustice and partiality? Why represent that the afflictions and tribulations we all endure, saint and sinner, are not administered to "us in exact observance of," the principle of justice? Was this the view which God's ancient servants cherished? No. I am persuaded that our author does not understand the meaning of the term justice, its office, its nature. He represents it as having no pity, no mercy, and no forgiveness.— This would be effectually robbing God of justice, or virtually denying that he possesses this attribute at all. Has God no pity, no mercy, and no forgiveness? If he has, then *his* justice cannot conflict with his nature. For his justice is not cruel, does not seek an eternity of pain to glut its own vindictive rage, nor pain of any kind merely for its own sake. God's justice is always guided by his love. They exist together *indissolubly* in the most friendly intimacy, having one and the same object in view. He says "mercy cannot be extended on principles of justice." This argues that God cannot be merciful to us without being unjust. Or he cannot extend mercy without opposing himself, for we are told in his word that he is "a just God and Savior."

Who with this view can pray for God's mercy? He says, "mercy cannot be known in our case" if justice has its demands. And after stating what he conceives to be the office and nature of mercy, he inquires, "does he then deal with us according to justice?" I answer, yes, for it would be the height of impiety to say that God at any time, or under any circumstances, deals with us in *discordance* with his own nature. I am surprised that any man, bearing the christian name, should ask such a question. It borders hard upon infidelity.

Again, he says, "The idea, therefore, that we are under a dispensation of rewards and punishments, and that God is dealing with us daily on principles of vindictive justice, shuts mercy out of the world." Well, I have proved beyond successful contradiction, that we do live under a dispensation of rewards and punishments, and that God is now dealing with us on principles of vindictive justice, that is, a justice which vindicates the perfection of God and the harmoniousness of all his attributes; and mercy is not shut out of the world yet. Paul who lived under a dispensation of rewards and punishments, and saw in his day justice meted out to man, said, "According to his *mercy* he saved us," &c. But God, who is *rich* in *mercy*, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ."

Now Paul, it seems, did not believe that God who was *once* "*rich in mercy*," had now, under the dispensation,

of the gospel and a dispensation of rewards and punishments, become poor, "shutting his mercy out of the world." Paul writes; "That the Gentiles might glorify God for his *mercy*." This was after the word of this dispensation was carried to them.

We all have reason to glorify God for his mercy.—For his mercy being rich, cannot be unjust; neither can his justice become unmerciful. Both being the offspring of God, they must both partake of his nature—fulfilling in harmony the design of their author; walking hand in hand under the same dispensation, never quitting the world while God reigns. That mercy is found even where rewards and punishments are administered, you will learn from God's servant David. He says, "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercies, for thou renderest to *every man* according to his works." This is spoken in the present tense, and covers the whole ground of our controversy. It is *every* man who receives, and receives *according* to his works. Let then the testimony of David upon this point suffice.

Your attention is now invited to one of our opponent's strongest points. He supposes a case: A highway-man who lives by rapine and plunder meets a poor laboring man, murders him, then robs him of all he has. On the same night he himself dies in a fit of debauch. Then our author inquires, "Is justice meted out to these individuals alike? This and similar circumstances presented under different forms, are the

first in order and first in importance, which are presented to stop the mouth of a Universalist. I scarcely ever conversed with an opponent long on the different points of our faith, but that they were thrust in my face as containing an unanswerable argument against the doctrine of God's universal grace. Before I give an answer to this very popular objection, I will quote another of his supposed cases : A man commits murder, but an innocent man is hung for the deed, " while the actual murderer goes to his grave without being detected." " Is there, (inquires he) in this case, an equal distribution of rewards and punishments ? Does justice overtake the murderer ?" These two cases include the sum and substance of all others our author has named ; and if I give a satisfactory answer to these, it will suffice for the whole. I would like however to notice every particular case, and give a direct answer to every peculiar feature, did my limits allow me ; for I love to keep in close company with my opponent, and meet him in every position into which his controversial disposition may lead him.

In order to get our subject fairly before the mind, let us make a few inquiries. Speaking of the murderer and the innocent man, he inquires, " Is there in this case an equal distribution of rewards and punishments ?" In order to answer this question clearly, we should first decide what reward is, and what punishment is, and *what* would be an unequal distribution of each. For I

am not obliged to take every man's whim, or any one man's notion upon this point as a standard. One man will contend that it is just to hang a man for murder; another with as much sincerity and zeal will contend there is no justice in it, it is positive cruelty and revenge. Another man says the murderer ought not only to be hung, but to be tortured with excruciating tortures in a state of imprisonment, solitary confinement, or banishment for a period, then executed upon a gallows and sent to another world to endure the most awful, agonizing, and excruciating pains under the wrath of God eternally. Verily, in the midst of such visionary, confused, and conflicting notions concerning what constitutes justice in the murderer's deserts, where shall we take our stand? Shall we say arbitrarily that this mode of punishment or that is just, or this degree of punishment or that is just, and none other? It is a great question to decide; and who can decide, but God alone? Will our author pretend to define the exact amount and duration of punishment this murderer deserved, and thereby tell us *precisely* what would be an equal distribution of rewards and punishments, to the innocent and the guilty in this case?

If as he contends the sinner justly deserves to be *endlessly* miserable, and cannot be adequately punished with any thing short of this; then I answer, that justice did not overtake the murderer. But is he right in his position? That remains to be proved. What

other degree of punishment then would be just? Ah, that is a question which none but God can understandingly and correctly answer. Still we may reason upon the subject, and give such an answer as reason seems to sanction.

Under the Chinese government, virtue is rewarded as well as vice is punished. Other governments punish vice without rewarding virtue. All governments however punish vice; but we find that all do not administer the same kind or degree of punishment for the same vice. Hence men's judgments differ upon this subject. One says that this kind or degree of punishment, and this kind or degree of reward are not administered on the principle of strict and equal justice, but another says they are. So men differ. But if I do not succeed in proving to the entire satisfaction of my opponent that there is in this case before us "an equal distribution of justice," my want of success will not prove that there is an unequal distribution of justice.

Facts are facts, whether proved or disproved. Our author supposes that there was an unequal distribution of justice, because the *innocent* man was hung, and the *murderer* escaped. But had the murderer been hung all would have been right, justice would have been satisfied, and no occasion would have been given for to charge God with an unequal distribution of justice. But this appears to me very strange logic. Had the *murderer* been hung, he supposes justice would

been satisfied. I think the reverse ; justice would have been violated. Herein we differ. It remains for him to *prove* that justice would have been administered had the murderer been *hung*. And besides, it remains for him to prove that such a mode of punishment as hanging a man, is *God's* punishment. His whole argument is based upon the position that it is, and that justice is satisfied therein. Until he *proves* these positions, it is useless for me to argue with him. For I can see no force whatever in the supposed case before us to prove the point at issue. In relation to the murderer's escaping detection, he inquires, "does justice overtake the murderer?" He would answer no. And why? because he was not killed by the Sheriff or some hiring. Had he been, he would not have asked the question he did. I should be very reluctant to place myself entirely under the government of a man who was actuated by such a justice which seeks to gratify itself by *taking life*?

When we look at the two cases before us in the light of strict justice, (I do not mean by justice the principle of revenge or retaliation, but a principle that seeks for good and returns good for evil,) I say when we look at the two cases before us in the light of this principle, we shall not discover so great an unequal "distribution of rewards and punishments," as may appear to the mind of our author. For if *human* justice, such as consists in taking life, did not overtake the murder-

er, it is no proof that God's justice did not overtake him. And our author *dare not deny it*; so his supposed case is a mere *nullity*. If *human* justice does not overtake the murderer, God's justice never fails, and it waits not for human tribunals either. It is at work in the deep recesses of the heart long before the deeds thereof are discovered by the human eye. Let us not say that God is unjust or has not distributed equal justice, because erring man has not hung his fellow man, nor because he has done a deed of cruelty to the innocent. God is not to be charged with injustice because man does wrong. By no means. And this is man's work, of torturing the innocent for the deeds of the guilty. But the prophet said, "Man looketh on the outward appearance, but the *Lord* looketh on the *heart*." He looketh upon the heart of the innocent man, and upon that of the murderer, and knoweth what is just in each man's case. And will he not stand by the innocent man who is unjustly condemned by a deceived tribunal, and pour in untold and indescribable mental consolation? or will he forsake him and withdraw entirely the protection of his spirit from him? Who can believe it? Will the truly pious and enlightened christian believe it? Where, christians, is your boasted confidence in the protecting care of God over his cruelly persecuted servants? Did he not say by his spirit to the afflicted Paul that he might not flag with discouragements, "My grace is sufficient for thee?" Look

at the numerous cases where martyrs have fallen victims to the merciless rage of their persecutors for speaking and acting conscientiously in defense of God's truth, and see with what calmness and composure, with what serenity of disposition and temper they met their fate. Look at the case of Stephen, who was publicly stoned to death. And will you not say God was with him, giving him that inward peace and resignation of spirit which defied the rage of his merciless foes to overcome?

And look at the supposed case of our author. See that innocent man standing upon the scaffold, condemned for murder. Who can fathom the mental peace of that man and the serene joys which cannot find utterance in words? Could you go down into that man's heart and search and know and understand all the undisturbed joys and tranquillity there reigning as the fruit of conscientious innocence, you would exclaim in the fulness of your soul, God has not been unjust, has not withheld his rich reward from the upright. Look at that man again as he stands upon the scaffold, just ready to be executed. There you will hear him say, if he speaks at all, as he looks upon the throng gathered to witness his execution, and beholds the murderer among the rest who had procured his condemnation, Sir, though by perjury and intrigue you have brought me, an innocent man, to this situation, awful as it may appear, yet, with all the tortures and suffering that are about to

be inflicted on my body, I would not exchange my situation for yours, for the peace and inward satisfaction arising from a consciousness of innocency is a rich reward to me, and worth more than all your enjoyment through a long life. For my bodily pain will be of brief duration; a few pangs and all is over; but your pain, sir, is inward, deep and aggravating, and will cling to you till the hour of your death. My bodily pain may be severe, my enemies may torture this mortal frame, yet my mind lives and rests in God.

There is another consideration connected with the situation of this innocent man. And it is one direct to the point on the subject of rewards. This innocent person, though suffering bodily pain, enjoys more real, solid happiness in the inner man in his situation, than he could have experienced in his whole life under entirely dissimilar circumstances.

His situation heightens his enjoyments, gives a brighter relish, a higher zest to, a more animating and sensible experience of the rewards of innocence.— Hence the apostle said, “Though the outward man perish, yet the inward man is *renewed* day by day.”— How true is this in the case before us. The increased enjoyment of this innocent man in his situation, counterbalances and transcends the bodily pain he endures; so that here we may behold in the clear sunlight of truth the wisdom of God, and how “he causes the *wrath* of man to praise him.”

I need say but little if any more, in this place, to make the subject before us plain to the understanding of all, as regards the equal distribution of God's justice and the administration of rewards and punishments. Divesting your minds of prejudice and false preconceived opinions, and looking at this subject as you ought, in candor, in the light of scripture and moral science, much of the darkness and obscurity cast over it by error, will disappear. You are to be careful not to confound opposites. That is, you will bear in mind that human laws are not God's laws; that human governments are not God's governments; that human justice is not God's justice; and though man may fail to reward the innocent, not having it in his power to do so, yet God, "who searcheth the heart and trieth the reins, even to give to every man according to his works," will not fail: and though human justice may not overtake the guilty, yet God's justice, which is never asleep, will; ferreting out the offender, following him into all his lurking places and holding a sword over him to cut off his happiness on earth.

LECTURE IV.

In my last, I called your attention to our author's supposed case of a "highway-man who lives by rapine and murder," who meets a poor laboring man, mur-

ders him, then robs him of all he has. On the same night he himself dies in a fit of debauch. Then our author inquires, "Is justice meted out to these individuals alike?" Upon this supposed case, I now propose to offer a few remarks, and particularly in relation to the question, "What becomes of the wretch by whom the innocent man was murdered and plundered; and who for years has made it his business to perpetrate similar deeds of darkness? Does he go to heaven with the victim of his cruelty? Do they both meet on that same night, as loving brothers, at the Savior's throne?" I answer, if they meet in heaven, they surely meet "*as loving brothers,*" and in no other way. No one but a fiend can object to this.—It is a matter of no consequence as regards the *time* of meeting: it is sufficient for us to know that *when* they meet, they meet "*as loving brothers,*" all enmity and blood-thirstiness having been overcome by "the grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men." To our author it seems a matter of inexpressible wonder that two men so dissimilar in character should ever meet in heaven. But there are other wonders equally great. The unbelieving Jews might have said in relation to Paul while he was on his way to Damascus filled with murder and revenge—will he whose firmness is proverbial, and whose hostility to the christians is unyielding, *will he, this night meet as a loving brother with those whose destruction he seeks?* You could not make a

single Jew believe it. Nothing short of a miracle itself could have made a Jew believe so great a change could have been effected in so short a time, and that man so entirely dissimilar as Paul and the christians should grasp each other by the hand fraternally as brothers of one family. Indeed to the mind of the Jew there was something vastly more marvelous and more unaccountable in this change than there is to us in the meeting of the murderer and his victim in heaven "as loving brothers." The Jew's belief or unbelief did not alter the fact. God's grace effects marvelous changes independently of belief. And hence Paul said, after his conversion, "by the grace of God I am what I am." The same grace that converted him, a murderer, is able to convert other murderers also, for it is

"not confined,

To any measured space of time."

Supposing Saul had murdered one of the good and pious christians while he was on his way to Damascus, and after this had been converted, as it is reported he was, and one moment after his conversion had died—would not Mr. Stearns say that the converted Saul, and "the victim of his cruelty," would meet in heaven "as loving brothers?" And what prepared Saul for this happy meeting? The grace of God and that only, unsought, and unasked, for by the grace of God he was *what he was*, after his conversion.

Now if this grace, unsought, unasked, reached the heart of this murderer, and in the time and manner it did, so unexpectedly and so mysteriously ; what valid reason have we for not believing that the same grace will apply its cleansing power, unasked and unsought to this highway-man and murderer under different circumstances ? But it may be said that this murderer died before the grace of God was applied in a manner to cleanse him. But this is no argument against my reasoning, for "neither life nor death—can separate us from the love of God," says this same Paul who was converted ; and if so, death cannot separate us from the *grace* of God, or place us beyond its reach. Paul was *as* a dead man, before he was converted, for he neither sought nor asked for the converting grace of God to be applied, no more than a literally dead man. Besides, God employs different means to produce the same ends, and varied temporal changes, before he applies the cleansing operation of his grace. In one instance he may strike a man down to the earth in death, and effect this change as a necessary accompaniment of the purifying process of his grace. In another, he may strike a man to the earth, blind and dumb, as *is* the case of Paul, before he applies the cicatrizing power of his grace. So, that we have no more authority for limiting the grace of God, than we have for limiting *his* love. And as death cannot separate us from *the* love of God, so neither can it separate us from hi

grace. For, says Paul again, "whether we live or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living."

If then, we are the Lord's inheritance whether we live or die, and death even cannot separate us from his love, what possible evidence can there be adduced to prove that death places any man beyond the reach of God's grace? None whatever. And here I am happy to be able to present before you the language of Mr. Stearns himself, corroborating this answer. He says on page 27, that "God is under no necessity of sending men to hell, and subjecting them to a long course of discipline, before they will repent. *He can change their hearts at any time and under any circumstances.*" I defy Mr. Stearns to refute his own assertion. He cannot do it—he dare not attempt it, for such an attempt would be to limit the sovereignty of God and charge him with weakness. Surely, he will not attempt a work of this kind knowingly. Mark his language—"He [God] *can change their hearts at ANY TIME, and under ANY CIRCUMSTANCES.*" What, then, is there in his eyes so marvelous, in the supposed case of the murderer and the innocent man? Does he doubt the truth of his own declaration? It must be. He has no confidence to believe that God can change the heart of such a murderer towards his "victim at any time, and under any circumstances, that they may meet

as loving brothers at the Savior's throne." I sincerely pity the man who is tormented with such doubts, and especially Mr. Stearns, who, by a certain mode of reasoning, was compelled to admit a truth, which at another time he doubts or denies.

That the grace of God reaches beyond death, and hence substantiates and confirms the truth of my opponent's remark, I will refer you and him to the testimony of Paul in his letter to the Romans, fifth chapter. Speaking of the grace of God, which he calls a "free gift," he says, verse 15, "If through the offence of one, many be dead; much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. Ver. 13.—"Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the *whole gift* came upon all men unto justification of life. For, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so, by the obedience of one, shall many (the same number) be made righteous. Moreover, the law entered, that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, *grace did much more abound*: that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so, might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord."—Concerning the extent and efficiency of this grace Dr. Adam Clark justly and truthfully remarks, in the language of Dr. Taylor, "That the *free gift* stands upon

a reason and foundation in excellence and worth, *vastly* surpassing the malignity and demerit of the offense; and consequently capable of producing benefits *vastly beyond* the sufferings occasioned by the offense. This is the force of the apostle's argument." Again, Clark says, "That *the many*, of the apostle, here means *all mankind*. And if *the many*, that is, *all mankind*, have died through the offense of one, certainly the *gift by grace*, which abounds unto *the many*, by Christ Jesus, must have reference to *every human being*. Thus we find, that the salvation from sin here, is as extensive and complete as the *guilt* and *contamination* of sin; death is conquered, hell disappointed, the devil confounded, and sin totally destroyed. Here is glorying, *to Him that loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to God and his Father, be glory and dominion for ever and ever, Amen. Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth! Amen, and Amen.*"

Truly might this learned man say, "Here is glorying." There was something enrapturing to the contemplation that the grace of God or "gift of righteousness," should extend beyond sin and death, so that both shall be "*totally destroyed*." He burst in sunder the shackles of his enslaving narrow creed, and let his pent up mind take a noble flight upward and abroad amid the spiritual immensities of the Eternal, till he had lost sight of his low and narrow conceptions of God's saving

plan, and was lost in enrapturing amazement, so that in the fulness and gratitude of his soul he exclaims, "Hallelujah! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

I would that my opponent had such exalted and worthy conceptions of the divine character and plan of salvation, and that he would no longer be found fighting against the apostle in "limiting the Holy One of Israel." For how wretched and unhappy must that heart be that circumscribes the divine grace by the bounds of time, or that supposes the all-wise and good God will allow death to dry up for ever the broad streams of his grace that they can flow no further. Away from my mind be such unhallowed thoughts! For if it be true that the grace of God is absolutely confined to this life, what will become of the countless myriads of infants who have gone down to the grave without being prepared here, for the felicities of heaven above? What will our author answer? I will give him an answer in the language of Dr. Clark. He says, "We may justly infer, and all the *justice* as well as the *mercy* of the Godhead supports the inference, that all human beings, dying in an *infant* state, are regenerated by that *grace of God which bringeth salvation to all men.*—Tit. 2: 11." If then it be a truth, and one which the *justice* and *mercy* of God support, that the regenerating grace of God will be extended to *infants* in another state; what is there so contrary to the justice and *mercy of God* in the inference that the same grace will

be extended to adults, even to the murderer who *most needs* its sanctifying and regenerating power? Who can tell? The same reason that denies its application to the latter would deny it to the former. For surely there is nothing in the character of either that can *claim* any benefit from the grace of God, or lay God under any *obligation* to bestow the benefits of his grace. As regards this matter they stand on precisely the same ground. On what principle then will God grant his grace to the one, and forever refuse it to the other?—Can any man answer, and yet maintain the fatherly kindness and impartial goodness of our divine Author? No, NEVER. Let me then renounce a corrupt creed; rather than retain it and impeach the divine character, and render myself wretched all my days.

My clerical opponent seems to be tormented with doubts concerning the perfect administration of God's justice here. And hence he inquires in relation to the case of this murderer: "Where is justice?" It has not overtaken that wicked man who dies stained with innocent blood." How does he know? Is he sure that God is unjust? He has affirmed that which I am not willing to sanction. I have shown in a former lecture that though human justice or the execution of human laws may not overtake the murderer, yet this is no evidence that God's justice has been equally tardy and has not reached the bloody offender. His justice is at work down deep in the heart, and executing its righteous

sentence, while the eye of human justice is asleep.— But my opponent says, “He must meet his doom in another world, or justice falls to the ground, and the government of God is not administered on principles of equity.” What is that doom? He would answer, “infinite punishment.” In this, justice would be done; justice would overtake “that wicked man.” But this is begging the question altogether. The “doom” which justice pronounces is not necessarily endless.— On the contrary, her own nature forbids such a doom.

Justice is but a modification of goodness. And that cannot be goodness which produces no good. Our author himself has admitted this, and of course admitted an argument against himself. For he says in relation to future punishment, that “It has no direct reference to the good of the offender.” If this be justice, to inflict punishment without designing the good of the punished, then I confess I do not understand the meaning of the term justice. See the same view of punishment given on page 29, where he says, “that the punishment of the wicked is not designed for their good.”

If we follow out our author’s reasoning, we shall find in reality that in his view justice is only another name for cruelty. For according to his reasoning, the just doom of the murderer referred to, is that punishment which is not designed for his good. If this be true, *pray tell me wherein is the goodness of taking him*

away and inflicting such punishment in the future, for *strict justice* is no more satisfied there than here.— Cruelty may strive to satisfy her insatiable thirst, and revenge may seek to glut her omnivorous appetite, but goodness will forever remain unsatisfied still. Why then talk about and complain of uneven handed justice here? Why tell of justice falling to the ground, when it is argued that justice will eternally fall to the ground hereafter, and cruelty will wave her banner of victory, shouting in fiendish accents over her fallen victim!— I have indeed no love for a system which banishes justice wholly and totally from the government of God, here and hereafter. Let those advocate it who have cruelty enough at heart to do so, and who can find any satisfaction therein.

In the circumstances of the two individuals before us, our author sees a great inequality, and an eternity only can correct the inequality, showing that “the government of God is” therein “administered on principles of equity.” If the administration of his government is hereafter to be changed, bettered or improved, why will not man also be changed and improved? Why will not all wrongs be corrected, all imperfection be done away, and righteousness become universal? Is there any thing more irrational in this, than to suppose there will be a change in God’s mode of administering his government? Why maintain this change and yet contend that *man will not be changed*?

There is a strange inconsistency here. We have always been told that there is no change after death.— But here we are certified by this author that what is imperfect here in the divine government, will be perfected hereafter ; what is incomplete here will be completed hereafter ; and where justice has failed to execute her stern demands, hereafter full and equal justice will be done, and the government of God will be administered on principles of universal equity. Thence forward there will be no need of any further change, all things will remain eternally fixed. All this appears clear to his perception. But man, *only man*, amid the vastness of the Creator's works, remains at death the same, unchanged in his moral pollution to all eternity. What was imperfect in him remains imperfect still.

Again : he can see no harmony in the divine government, and no equal justice in the two cases before us. But on pages 51 and 52, he writes as though he intended to correct his mistake here, and refute his own position. He refers us to the great differences in birth and fortune, and to the fact that "some enjoy health and prosperity through life ; others are sickly, poor, and suffer through life." He then refers us to a supposed objection which one might start, "that in all these diverse providences God is partial." "This however," says he, "can not be admitted, for it would impeach his moral character. We know that he does make this difference ; we know too from his character,

revealed in the holy scripture, that he is no respecter of persons. In making this difference, he does no injustice to those on whom he does not bestow favors equally with others. They have no reason to complain of God, &c.

Here, while speaking upon another subject, and answering objections to the partiality of his theory, he could see no injustice or lack of justice "in all these diverse providences:" all is right, equitable, just and impartial, and no man has a right to complain; hence he says, "God does *no injustice* to those on whom he does not bestow favors equally with others. They have no reason to complain of God." This he wrote while his mind had lost sight of the case of the murderer and the murdered. The inequality or unequal distribution of justice in the cases to which he cited us, is as great and apparent as in the former case; yet in relation to that case he would say we have "reason to complain of God," or charge him with injustice and partiality *unless this inequality is some how removed in another life*. But how is this inequality removed? According to his view it will be removed by taking the murderer and the innocent man into another state of being, and there making the latter infinitely happy, and the former infinitely miserable, and thus render the inequality infinitely greater! This is the way he proposes to have it removed, and the only way in which he can perceive it can be done, and in this he can see

full justice, impartial justice," and "the government of God administered on principles of equity."

When he says in relation to the case of the murderer, "Where is justice? It has not overtaken that wicked man," what does he mean by justice? He says "the demerit of crime is infinite;—we justly deserve to be endlessly miserable." Then evidently he meant that this penalty had "not overtaken" the "man who died stained with innocent blood," and because it had not, he argues that it ought to overtake him "or justice falls to the ground, and the government of God is not administered on principles of equity." Now in order to show the inconsistency of his own theory, let us suppose a case. We will take this same murderer, and instead of following him to his nocturnal revels and scenes of debauch, we will follow him to the gloomy prison. There he is visited by the good minister, Mr. Stearns, who kneels and prays over him, and exhorts and entreats him in tears to give up his soul to God and get religion, that he may die happy and be admitted among the blessed in that world whither he is going. He does so, yields to the solemn entreaties of his friend and gives satisfactory evidence that he is born of God, and is a fit heir of heaven. He is now led out of his cell, hurried away to the gallows, is executed, and his soul takes its heavenward flight to rest forever with the blessed above. In the language of this *good minister* we inquire, "Where is justice? It has

not overtaken that wicked man." And would he add, "He must meet his doom in another world, or justice falls to the ground, and the government of God is not administered on principles of equity?" No, not he; the scene is now changed, and he can behold justice done without the murderer being punished at all, and the government of God administered on principles of equity. If by the sinner's not being punished in this life, justice falls to the ground, I see no good reason why justice will not fall to the ground if he is not punished in a future life, arguing from his own premises. And besides, it seems quite inconsistent to take direct means to cause justice to fall to the ground, because justice fell here. This would be a strange way of perfecting what was imperfect here, or of satisfying the claims of justice by preventing her from ever having them hereafter. But I will not multiply remarks upon this point, lest I weary your patience. I will leave our author to extricate himself from this sad dilemma into which he has unintentionally thrown himself.

He seems to contend, and his whole theory is based upon the supposed fact, that the murderer has all along lived in ease, and justice has never taken cognizance of his deeds—has never overtaken him, but he has sinned all along for years, committing rapine and murder with impunity. But no supposition can be more false and pernicious. Will Mr. Stearns say that this wretch, who for years has made it his business to perpetrate

similar deeds of darkness," had a peaceful conscience, that he had rest of soul, and nothing troubled him?—If "one can go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned," then can a man commit "deeds of darkness for years" and not feel the burnings of a guilty conscience. Look at the case of Cain, the murderer, and ask him if even *while he was planning* the murder of his brother, he could lay his hand on his heart and say, all is peace and quietness there. Ask him, after the bloody deed was committed, if his conscience did not goad and lacerate him with inexpressible tortures, and you would hear coming up from the depth of his soul, this moving, this pathetic and earnest exclamation, "My punishment is greater than I can bear!"—And after hearing this honest confession, would you still persist in saying that "punishment" is not inflicted in this life—that "justice has not overtaken that wicked man?" Where, I would ask, is justice? Is it asleep amid all the wrongs and murders in the world, and to be awaked to her duty in a future life only?—Tell me not, and say not to the ungodly that "justice falls to the ground" in a state of lethargy and inactivity, and neglects to execute her stern decrees upon the murderer and every wrong doer, for God "will not hold him guiltless" who tramples under foot his law. The scripture declaration is, "No murderer *hath* eternal life abiding in him." This is self-evident. He *who has murder in his heart* has not the principles of

eternal life, or moral holiness. And if he has not *life* he has *death*—moral death, and there can be no such thing as moral death without wretchedness.

In order to make this subject plainer and present it clearly to your understanding, I will present before you an extract from Tacitus, the Roman historian, who, speaking of the wretched moral condition of the Emperor Tiberius in his last days, says of him who had been cruel and tyrannical, "We have here the tortures of the inward man. His crimes retaliated upon him with keenest retribution; so true is the saying of the great philosopher, the oracle of ancient wisdom, 'that if the minds of tyrants were laid open to our view, we should see them gnashed and mangled with the whips and stings of horror and remorse.' By blows and stripes the flesh is made to quiver, and in like manner cruelty and inordinate passions, malice and evil deeds, become internal executioners, and with increasing torture goad and lacerate the heart. Of this truth Tiberius is a melancholy example. Neither the imperial dignity, nor the gloom of solitude, nor the rocks of Caprera could shield him from himself.—He lived on the rack of guilt, and his wounded spirit groaned with agony."

What is here said of Tiberius, may be said of every Roman emperor and Roman governor who had laid violent hands upon men or cruelly persecuted the christians. Even of Nero it is said, that four years of

for his unexampled cruelty to christians in burning and torturing them in various ways, he being in great distress of mind, attempted to kill himself. His distress was intolerable, he could bear it no longer, and might have exclaimed with Cain, "My punishment is greater than I can bear." His attempt to commit suicide shows that the agonies of his mind were intensely awful. It is affirmed of him, however, that "He had not the resolution to do that piece of justice to the world, and was forced to beg assistance." He earnestly entreated and besought others to take his life, that he might be delivered from the burning hell into which his wickedness had thrown him; for his internal agonies and the throes of a guilty conscience were intolerable.

Look at Herod Agrippa who murdered James, and at Judas who betrayed our Lord, as examples of penal suffering: the former was eaten of worms, and died a miserable death; the latter was absorbed with inexpressible grief; horror and remorse, and guilt of conscience being his internal executioners.

Look also at Catullus, governor of Lybya, who, in connexion with other judgments which he suffered, "fell into a complicated and incurable disease, being sorely tormented both in body and mind. He was dreadfully terrified, and continually crying out that he was haunted by the ghosts of those whom he had murdered, and, not being able to contain himself, he leaped out of his bed, as if he were tortured with fire and

put to the rack. His distemper increased till his entrails were all corrupted, and came out of his body; and thus he perished, as signal an example as ever was known of the divine justice rendering to the wicked according to their deeds."

Who, in the face of these facts, can say the way of transgressors is not hard? In the case of the murderer, what mean those violent convulsions of body and mind—that sudden starting as though the ghost of the murdered were haunting him or hovering around him to bring him to condign punishment—that trembling and fear as he lays upon his couch in the loneliness of the night, his eyes refusing to close in sleep, his ever wakeful imagination telling him that every sound he hears is the sound of the officer's footsteps, and the clanking of the chains that are to bind him: what means all this, I say, if he is not thrown upon the rack of guilt, and justice is not doing her retributive work in faithfulness? Has "justice fallen to the ground?" Nay, he can never flee from her or elude her search.

"His life is an oppressive load,
That hangs upon him like a curse;
For all the pleasures—thoughts that glanced,
Are now extinguished by remorse!
And death! ah, death! 't is worse, 't is worse!"

His is a living and abiding death. He lives in death, and is a subject of agonizing tortures while he lives.—
He startles at the rustling of a leaf. The gentle breeze

even that falls upon the lattice of his window, conveys to him mournful sounds, perhaps the moans of the dying. The song of the bird that perches in the shade at his door, the gambol of the flocks in his field, the sports of the kitten upon his hearth, and the playfulness of his children upon his lap, all administer no consolation to his aching heart, no mitigation of his woes, but rather heighten his torment by contrasting his guilt and wretched condition with the innocency and joyousness of the objects around him. Poor, *misérable* man indeed! This is no fancy sketch—it is a sober reality, to which the experience of thousands upon thousands bear testimony.

Says Solomon, "The heart knoweth his own bitterness. Even in laughter the heart is sorrowful; and the end of that mirth is heaviness." How true, how undeniably true. Often has the forced smile been put on to conceal inward distress. Though cheerfulness may clothe the countenance and hilarity may be painted upon every lineament, yet down in the heart is sorrow that tongue cannot express. So outward appearances often deceive, yet it is still true as the wise man said, "The heart knoweth its *own* bitterness."

It is a notorious fact, that in more than one sense "Some men's sins are open beforehand going to judgment." Their sins are open to inspection before the *internal witness*, and their evil motive is arraigned *before the tribunal of their consciences, before the*

conceived is committed. And think you that at that tribunal the evil motive will be acquitted? Will it not rather be condemned instantly? Yes, for conscience is not under the necessity of waiting for the arrival of a jury and witness; it is itself judge, jury and witness, and always judges justly. And what is no less true, is the fact, that this tribunal or judgment is set up in the very kingdom where the deed is committed. Where should it be, if not there? Can any one tell? As sin exercises usurped authority, and is represented as holding unlawful dominion, rebelling against the principles of holiness and truth, it is reasonable to suppose that it will be brought to judgment in that kingdom where it rebelled, and where it exercised usurped authority. That kingdom is this body of flesh and blood. And as the scriptures give no intimation that flesh and blood will inherit the future immortal life, but on the contrary inform us that the natural body will be raised a spiritual, glorious and incorruptible body, we have reason to hope and affirm that sin and suffering will not exist in the resurrection state and after this "body of sin and death" is destroyed. We derive our authority for hoping thus from the apostle Paul, who says, Rom. 6, 7, "For he that is dead is freed from sin." That this death is natural, or the death of the body, is evident from the context and the main scope of the apostle's reasoning, which he gave by analogy, that as natural death frees or delivers a man from sinning, so does dy-

ing unto sin free him from the practice of it. This view is expressed by Professor Stuart in his comment on this passage, "This verse," says he, "may be regarded as a kind of general maxim or truth, in regard to all such as die physically or naturally. The object of the writer is, to draw a comparison between the effects of *natural* death, and those of *spiritual* death; the first causes men to cease from all action, and of course from their transgressions; and by analogy we may conclude, that the second, which is death unto sin, will do as much. The saying in its physical sense, was probably a *proverbial* one among the Jews. Thus, in the Talmud, it is said: 'When a man dies, he is freed from the commands'—*Tract, Nidda*. Now what is said of the common proverb adduced by the apostle in a physical respect, (and correctly said in the sense intended to be conveyed,) the apostle means to intimate will apply, in a *spiritual* respect, to one who is *spiritually* dead as to sin, i. e., he must become free from its influence. His great object is to illustrate and enforce this point."

If literal death be not meant in the passage, I see no force in the apostle's reasoning. For he would have simply said, "he that is dead to sin, is dead to sin," which in reality would be saying nothing. It appears to me nothing can be plainer than that the apostle here refers to natural death. predicating his argument upon the fact that the literally dead were freed from sin, for

this good reason, that the body of sin being destroyed, sin could no longer exist. If the body of sin is destroyed, then sin can have no kingdom to reign in, no aliment to feed upon, and of course must die unless it is self-existent. My hearers, do you know, or can you conceive of any way and manner in which sin can live and reign without a body of flesh and blood? Did it ever reign any where else, and can it? Do the scriptures inform us that it ever had any other dwelling place or can have? In vain will you look for such information in that blessed book. For information concerning the origin and dwelling place of sin, and even its termination, you will please examine the 6th and 7th chap. of Rom., and James 1 : 15, where it is said, "sin, when it is *finished*, bringeth forth death."—This is synonymous with saying, that sin can not reign beyond death. It cannot pass that line—it is *finished* and has done all that it can do, it has received its "wages" and is discharged. Hence Paul says, Rom. 6 : 21, "That as sin hath reigned *unto* death, [not beyond it,] even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Here the apostle traces up the reign of sin to death, and there leaves it. I would to God that every professed follower of Christ would imitate the apostle's example.

Again, in Romans 6: 12, Paul speaks of sin's reigning in our "*mortal body*." But neither he nor the

other apostles have intimated that sin shall reign in an *immortal* body. It never has reigned in such a body, and therefore we have no authority for believing that it ever will. We are told that it reigns in a "*mortal body*," that it "*reigns unto death*," and that it is "*finished*" when "it bringeth forth death." This is scripture; but further than this the scripture saith not concerning sin.

I now anticipate an objection: It will be said, "If this doctrine be allowed, we may continue in sin."—Paul had a different view from this objection, and hence says, "God forbid: how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" That is, what encouragement have we to continue in sin from the fact that sin reigns only unto death, while grace superabounds it, reigning beyond it, and "through righteousness unto eternal life?" Does this encourage us to sin—does it do away all restraint? "God forbid." Is there so much pleasure in sin that a man will choose to continue in it? Who can be so deluded as to believe it? Have I not said enough in this lecture to prove to the understanding of every candid mind, that "the way of transgressors is hard"—that "there is no peace...to the wicked?" President Nott, of Union College, very truly remarked, "Even though there were *no God; no immortality; no accountability*; I would frown on vice, I would favor virtue: *vice in itself*, is mean, degrading, detestable; virtue commendable, exalting.

ennobling." This good man saw enough of the detestable and debasing qualities of vice to shun it ; and enough of the ennobling and elevating power of virtue to cling to it and follow its dictates. This is the true principle : a man should never be *driven* to practice virtue ; he should be drawn to its practice by a love of its intrinsic excellence. And he should shun vice from a sense of its degrading and unhappifying nature. Let every man, therefore, practice virtue from a heart-felt realizing sense of its intrinsic worth, believing that it is exalting, and ennobling ; and also shun vice *because* it is "*in itself* mean, degrading, detestable," and we shall see a *truly virtuous* people, and not till then.— When men are more influenced by slavish fear than by a love of goodness itself, or more by imaginary and distant sufferings, than by the benevolence and impartial goodness of God as shown to us in the gospel ; then we may expect all manner of wickedness and wrong doing, together with bigotry and false pride, which will multiply and continue to spread ruin round as at present. When I hear a man say if he believed and realized that sin should be "*finished, transgression cease,*" and all suffering come to an end, all restraint would be taken away, and he would indulge in all manner of sin ; I mark that man as wanting in the first rudiments of christianity, as one who is enslaved to fear, destitute of vital godliness at heart, having no correct view of the moral nature of goodness or evil, and as one who

fears hell and the devil more than he loves God and heaven, and is influenced more by that fear than this love. Such a man is not only unhappy, but he is a dangerous man, if he be a leader and teacher of the people; because he will lead others to be influenced by the same motive by which he is influenced himself. How can it be expected that a man will be truly good, who lives under a forced subjection, and has a forced respect for goodness or a respect which has not the love of the heart in it? The more we discover of God's goodness the stronger will be our motive to obey him. And this obedience will not be *forced* but *willing*, and such only is acceptable in the sight of God. Is not then the view I have given of God's moral government and of his plan of salvation, directly calculated to give us the best of all motives, and to lead us to "love God because he first loved us?" I answer, and close, in the language of Mr. Finney, of revival memory, who very clearly and forcibly remarks: "The sinner braves the wrath of Almighty God, and hardens himself to receive the heaviest bolt of Jehovah's thunder; but when he sees the *love* of his heavenly Father's heart, if there is any thing that will make him abhor and execrate himself, *that will do it*. Instead therefore of being afraid of exhibiting the love of God to sinners, *it is the ONLY way to make them truly submissive and truly benevolent. The law may make hypocrites; but nothing but the gospel can draw out the soul in true love to God.*"

LECTURE V.

I shall commence this lecture by calling your attention to the supposed argument against Universalism, found in God's dealings with the antediluvians, Sodomites, Egyptians, Ananias and Sapphira.

Our author observes, in relation to the antediluvians, that, "The Lord bought upon them the waters of the deluge and swept them all away. But Noah, the only righteous man of all the families of the earth, was spared to live many years in this world of suffering after the wicked were destroyed. Now, if Universalism be true, and there be no punishment after death, all those wicked men who died in the waters of the deluge went immediately to heaven. Who does not see that God dealt far better with them than with Noah? He took them to heaven, but left him on earth to suffer many years longer."

He fills out a lengthy paragraph, in which he attempts to show, that on the ground of Universalism the more wicked a man is, the sooner he gets to heaven and the greater God's favors towards him. And he refers us to the case of God's destroying the Egyptians, the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, and Ananias and Sapphira, as illustrating the same idea.

But he has committed a most egregious mistake in his views of our doctrine, as when he says ironically:

"When men become so wicked as to be unfit to live on earth, they may be ripe for heaven." Who ever taught such a doctrine? No man or class of men on earth. And I venture to say our author knew the fact when he penned the language quoted. For it would be no mark of charity to charge him with ignorance. Instead of teaching that men may be ripe for heaven while they are so wicked as not to be fit to live on earth, we have ever taught but one sentiment—that no man can enjoy heaven without holiness, and no wicked can enter that state unless God changes and fits him for it, by removing all sin from him. I know it is commonly affirmed of us, that we say all are going to heaven, good bad and indifferent—the most wicked and vile wretch among the rest, is to rush into heaven with all his guilt and moral corruption upon him. But be it known and remembered hence forth and forever, that we are no more careful or zealous in advocating Universal *salvation*, than we are in advocating Universal *reformation*. For we *know* of no salvation and *believe* in no salvation that is not preceded by reformation.

Our author, in the cases before us, seems to argue upon the assumed premises, that this life is a curse rather than a blessing from the hand of God, and that he shows especial mercy to the wicked by taking them out of the world, while he does not show mercy or favor to the righteous by permitting them to live. But *no more palpable error can be conceived, no assump-*

tion can be more unscriptural. For it is a sentiment universally taught in the scriptures that death, when it came as in the instance of the deluge, the destruction of Sodom, &c. was a judgment of God, a punishment for sin, an afflictive dispensation, a taking from the adjudged, a blessing; while, on the other hand, to preserve life is to show mercy, and to grant blessing. For life, being the gift of God, is a blessing. So the sacred writers understood this matter. Paul to the Philippians said, "I supposed it necessary to send unto you Epaphroditus, my brother; for indeed he was sick nigh unto death; but *God had mercy on him*; and not on him only, but on me also, lest I should have *sorrow upon sorrow*." Now notwithstanding Epaphroditus, as our author will admit, was prepared for immediate happiness after death, "*God had mercy on him*"—not in sending him off into immediate glory, but by preserving his life and continuing him in this state of being.—And besides, Paul would have had "*sorrow upon sorrow*," if his fellow-laborer in the ministry had been taken away; which shows that his feelings and views were very different from those of our author when he speaks to us about the advantages the antediluvians and others had over their surviving posterity, by being permitted to enter the heavenly state, while their posterity were left to linger longer upon earth, and wear out a miserable existence in this troublesome world.

Lot, who was saved from the destruction which came

upon the inhabitants of the plain, said, "*Thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast showed unto me, in saving my life.*" And again it is said, "The Lord being merciful unto him."

The scriptures universally represent that the death inflicted on the people of the old world was an evil, a judgment, a punishment for their sins—while the preservation of Noah, Lot, &c. was a reward on them for their righteousness. This is indisputable. It is therefore far better and safer to adhere to the plain instructions of the scriptures, than to the false and fanciful objections of men.

Facts and observation show that life is considered and felt to be a blessing, and death an evil. For with what avidity do all men cling to life and shun death, even those very persons who feel the utmost assurance of their own salvation? Such indeed will cling to life with the greater tenacity, because life to them has the greater blessing.

It is a fact which should be borne in mind, that in all that is said about the punishment or death of these wicked, and the blessing of the surviving, not one word is said about any other punishment than the destruction of life, or any other blessing than the preservation of life. This observation may astound you who have thought differently, but it is no more astounding than true.

Our author takes many things for granted which he ought first to have proved. He reasons upon the as

turned premises, that there is no change after death; the wicked Antediluvians and Sodomites, must remain unchangeably wicked as they were at their death, to all eternity. Take away this position and he has nothing to reason about. Let us examine this position a little and see whether it be sound or not.

To affirm that precisely the same character which attaches to man at death, will remain with him eternally, is in fact to affirm that there is no heaven or unsullied happiness in the coming world. For *no man living*, however perfect, can be said to need no change. He needs a change in his capacities, feelings, views, and actions before he is ripe for the company of angels and of God. Who then, with truth, proof and demonstration on his side can say, that the same unseen agencies which wrought *his* change and fitted *him* for heaven, will not also work a change in those who die with a greater degree of imperfection, and a greater stain upon their character? Reason and scripture would lead us to conclude that those who needed the physician most, would have the greater care, rather than to have no care or sympathy shown them at all. We would think that man *brutish*, yea worse than this, (for he finds no such example to imitate among the brute tribe,) who should pass by the man who had fallen into the fire and refuse, entirely refuse to help him out, and hasten to bestow all his care, sympathy and kindness upon the man who had but just received the

scratch of a pin upon his finger. Such a man you would call inhuman, a dreaded monster. But what are your instructions with regard to God's dealings with the morally sick and suffering? Compare it with this supposed case, and is it any better? No: it is infinitely worse. If your theory be correct, why not imitate God! The fact is, my hearers, men will be better than their creeds: their hearts will be more benevolent in deeds, than their heads are in theory. And I pray God to hasten the time when men shall live down their corrupt creeds, and shame them out of existence, and be willing to abandon a doctrine the practice of which among men would be abhorrent, which cannot be prayed for in sincerity, or lived up to conscientiously. Away with it from the earth, for it is fit neither to live by or to die by, and let it receive its merited oblivion.

When Christ said "They that are whole need not a physician but they that are sick," did he mean to insinuate that to those after death who were not sick God would show peculiar care and kindness; but to those who were "full of wounds and bruises and putrifying sores" he would manifest no regard, no kindness, no mercy? What was his language designed to teach us? That we should be more merciful and kind to the suffering and unfortunate than God? Why should a man having lost one sheep out of an hundred, leave the ninety and nine and go and search for the lost sheep and bring it back to the fold? Why should "the

good Shepherd care for the sheep," or "gather the lambs in his arms and carry them in his bosom, and bestow peculiar care upon the weak and sickly of his flock? Why did the apostle say, "Those members of the body, which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor?" What means all this, if my opponent's doctrine be true, that in the future world the most morally "sick," "the lost sheep," the most feeble of the flock, the apparently "less honorable members" of the human family, will have no mercy or kindness shown them? The truth is, and it must be plain to you all, that this doctrine dishonors God, and is refuted by *every example and precept* of our Savior. From what source then do we derive any evidence of the truth of this doctrine? Do we draw it from the character of God, from the nature of his law, from his relation to us, from the character, instruction, precepts and examples of his Son? No, from none of these sources do we derive countenance or support of the doctrine, for they are *all* against it. Where then do we get the evidence? We have none. The doctrine is wholly chimerical and visionary, the fruit of a distorted imagination.

What reason, I would ask, have we to believe that God will be less kind and merciful to his creatures in another state of existence than he is in this? Has he said that death closes the door of mercy, and his compassion is there cut off that it can extend no further?

Is the Holy One of Israel thus limited? He has said by his servant that his "mercy is from everlasting to everlasting," that is, it neither had a beginning nor will it have an end. And again, it is said, "his compassions fail not." "Thus speaketh the Lord of hosts, saying, execute true judgment, and show mercy and compassions every man to his brother." Will God refuse to carry out the spirit of this precept in his dealings with his creatures? I cannot believe it. What reason then have we to believe that God will not sanctify and save those whom he has taken away in their wickedness? those who most need the sanctifying and saving influence of his spirit? "Which is the most reasonable, to believe that he will, or that he has taken them away that he may make them worse? Is not the same grace that sanctified a David and a Paul, and a multitude of others still more wicked, sufficient to reach and sanctify those who are less so? Let Mr. Albert Barnes, a Presbyterian, answer. Says he, "It is not necessary that religion should make an eternal separation. There is nothing in the nature of christianity that naturally and necessarily demands this. There is no such adaptation of the gospel to one member or portion of a family only, as to make such a result inevitable. The blood which has been sprinkled on one heart may cleanse all; the same Spirit which has renewed and sanctified the father or the mother, is able to renew and sanctify each child." There is truth and consola-

tion in these remarks, and the benevolence of that man's heart forbade his cherishing any other view. It is honorable to God, and worthy to be credited by all his children.

To the mind of our author it seems incredible and awful that God should stop the sinner here in his mad career, and take him out of this world and introduce him into the company of the perfect above ; but he can contemplate with composure the supposed fact that God will take the wicked out of the world by death, then make them infinitely more wicked and miserable and render their improvement eternally impossible. This idea he can contemplate with satisfaction as being perfectly consistent, and reasonable, and even reconcilable with benevolence. Yes, the man can see benevolence in God's making his creatures infinitely worse than they now are ; but his vision is so beclouded or perverted that he can see no benevolence in God's stopping the sinner in his mad career by death, changing him for the better, eradicating from his heart all sinful desires, and clothing him in the white robes of everlasting righteousness. No, he can see nothing of benevolence in this, and hence he ridicules and sneers at it. But says he, such a change I object to, on the ground that it argues against man's accountability. I reply, it does not more so than the change from mortality to immortality ; and besides, this change from moral imperfection to perfection is no greater. Hence

there is neither impossibility, nor improbability; if there is in one change, there is also in the other. And he who effects the one will effect the other also, in accordance with the grand and all, comprehensive end designed, in which all his plans and promises center.

In the minds of many, death is a great stopping point, at which God's moral government over his creatures as moral agents will cease. Or, if it continue further, that is the point at which it changes its nature and object. This side of it, it seeks to reform and make better, but never beyond it.

Now to me the fact of the resurrection proves that God exercises a government over his creatures, and *all* his creatures, after death. And inasmuch as this is an indisputable fact, is it any less reasonable to suppose that God will put forth the reformatory energies of his nature to change man from moral imperfection to perfection; than that he will raise man from the dead or change him from mortality to immortality?—Indeed, I believe the former is included in the latter.—The two are nearly identical, or in other words, they are simultaneous, co-existent, and connatural. For I cannot conceive of an imperfect or unhappy immortality. The scriptures speak of no such thing. “As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” “And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.” This *shows that our resurrection change is from corruption,*

and from all corruption, to incorruption; from dishonor to glory, and from the natural to the spiritual. Such a change is worthy of a God of impartial benevolence, and presents an "aspect of paternal kindness, of condescending guardianship, and of the most gracious beneficence," showing that God's superabounding goodness and impartial love is not confined to the narrow bounds of time.

Let us turn again to notice the validity of the objector's theory. He would admit the Antediluvians and Sedomites, &c. into heaven if God had changed them one moment *before* death, and in this change he would see much goodness and mercy; but he would see strong objections and neither goodness nor mercy in his changing them *at* death, or one moment *after*. *One moment, or two at least*, would make an eternal difference.—Here, on the lapse of one moment, this inconceivably small point of time, is suspended man's eternal destiny of weal or woe. In the language of Watts we exclaim,

Good God, on what a brittle thread
Hang everlasting things,

If our objector can see any thing in this to admire, any thing to exalt his reverence and strengthen his love to God, he is welcome to it. Here he would argue that during this moment which lasts no longer than the time of extinguishing a taper, is a change effected in Deity great as the difference between heaven and hell and lasting as the ages of eternity.

But if there be any mercy or goodness in God, changing the sinner one moment *before* death, so as to admit him to heaven; why may he not with the same goodness and mercy change and make men holy one moment *after* death? I see no good reason why he may not, for he is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. Even Mr. Stearns himself has said on page 27 of his pamphlet, as quoted in a former lecture, that "He can change their hearts at any time and under *any circumstances.*" Here Mr. Stearns frankly admits the very fact for which I am contending. Though death may veil from our perception the *modus operandi* of God's reforming power, yet we are confident that the same hand that created, can recreate; the same that formed can reform; the same that changed the natural world from chaos to order, can transform the spiritual world into one of moral beauty and harmony. For those declarations of scripture which teach us of God's immutability, contain truths which are far, reaching, and lead our minds into futurity, to behold there the same kindness and love which were exercised towards us here; the same compassion that pitied, the same wisdom that planned, the same power that executed, the same grace that saved and the goodness that blessed. Again, we have the same hope and assurance given us in the scripture truth that the *last* enemy shall be destroyed, and that Christ must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet and subdued all things to

himself. These are truths which entirely and most solemnly forbid our cherishing the idea that God will close up forever the fountain of his mercy at death, and that he will not seek and effect the spiritual advancement and moral holiness of his creatures hereafter.

I ask then this candid auditory, to decide which is the most consistent with scripture, with the acknowledged attributes and perfections of God, the idea that God takes away the sinner by death, or changes his mode of being *for his good*, and will carry him on through the varying and unseen processes of his government till he is changed from all his unholiness and made pure in the sight of God; or, the idea that God changes the sinner's mode of being for the worse,—takes him out of the world, not to make him *better*, not to disarm him of his weapons of rebellion, but to perpetuate his sin and iniquity to all eternity, placing him where he never can be otherwise *than* wicked?—Which idea is the most consistent with goodness—which partakes the most largely of benevolence—and which example would you, if you had it in your power, imitate? There is but one answer, and that is on the side of truth. Even my opponent himself must see the utter worthlessness of his objection, and see that it is without point or force. Indeed he aims his objection, not at real Universalism, but at a shadow which exists only in his own fancy. For he builds his whole argument upon the false premises that this life is an evil—

punishment, and death a blessing, a fortunate and happy escape from a wearisome world of pain and tears.

Let us admit this, and then suppose a case for the sake of illustration:

One man murders another. The murderer is condemned to be hung, but before the day of execution, our author, a good and pious man, stirred with compassion visits him, and is an instrument of his conversion. And on the day of execution he and the felon both meet under the gallows. And now which ought to be hung according to our author's theory, the priest or the felon? If you hang the felon you do not *punish him*, you reward him with a release from this troublesome world, a world of weariness, of pain and woe. To *prolong* his life therefore, would be a punishment, and not a reward. But there stands the good pious priest, who is innocent before God; why should he be doomed to continue longer in this wearisome world; what has he done that he should be punished by lingering on in this vale of tears? why not release him from it and send him away to the rewards of heaven, when murderers, even, are? I am indebted to A. B. Grosh for the thoughts here penned. Let us bring his theory still closer to the test. While he and the felon are both standing under the gallows, take the rope and the cap and transfer them from the felon to him, and now begin to draw the cap over his eyes and adjust the rope about *his neck*, see if he did not prove to you that he had no

confidence in his own doctrine, for you would see him grasp as eagerly after the punishment of a long and wearisome life, as the felon would shrink from his reward. A by-stander might be supposed to inquire, "My good Sir, did you not inculcate the sentiment that God's prolonging the life of Noah was an evil, and a punishment, while the taking away of the Antediluvians was a more favorable dispensation? Why now shrink when your theory is brought to a practical test? But we will not press this point; as we have *found* our author, so we will *leave* him—HANGING HIMSELF.

After speaking of God's destroying the Egyptians in the Red Sea, he adds, "*But that good man, Moses, and the chosen people, were DOOMED to wander about on the deserts of Arabia, and to suffer afflictions in various ways, during forty years.*" Does not this language clearly state his views, that it is better for a righteous man to die and go to heaven, than to be "doomed to suffer afflictions in various ways" in this life? He says, "Was it not far *better* to die at once, as the Egyptians did, than to spend forty years suffering in the wilderness? The Egyptians had the *advantage* of the Israelites, in getting to heaven first;" (that is, on the supposition that God permitted them to enter there.)—The same language might be used in reference to Moses, who was the servant of God, and whom it will not be disputed, God would have admitted into heaven had he died. Hence we inquire in his own language, with

reference to Moses, "Was it not far better to die at once, as the Egyptians did, than to spend forty years suffering in the wilderness?" The fact is, the language asserts virtually, that a release from this life is great reward when compared with life itself, and the being doomed to continue in life is a great punishment. If this be so, then sure enough God is unequal, and does not administer his government on principles of impartial and distributive justice. It is strange that a man will attach almost every species of imperfection to the government of God, rather than to admit one particle of truth in Universalism, and in opposing one error admit numberless others still greater.

Let us quote more from our author and make an application of the sentiment conveyed, by supposing a case: On page 22, after speaking of God's taking away the wicked Antediluvians on account of their wickedness, and preserving righteous Noah still longer in this troublesome world, he says, "Therefore, the more wicked men are, the sooner they many times get through with their troubles, and the sooner they get to heaven."

Now we will suppose a case: A man murders me suddenly and unexpectedly, giving me no chance for repentance. He is permitted to live on—is blessed with a season for repentance—finally dies a humble penitent *and goes to heaven*, to see and hear, and rejoice in the *fact*, that his vengeance on me would be perpetuated *eternally*, and his maledictions and oaths pronounced

upon me in his profanity God would execute faithfully, and thus answer the prayers of his once wicked heart.

My God, is this doctrine true? I ask thee for sight, for thou hast required, "If any lack wisdom let him ask of God." I cannot believe this doctrine!—There is something in it infinitely more abhorrent and derogatory to the character of God than the worst feature which can possibly be put upon the doctrine of Universalism.

Now in looking at this supposed case before us candidly and impartially, you will plainly perceive that this man's murderous deed was a remote cause of his conversion, (as it placed him in circumstances which operated powerfully and directly to produce this result,) and of course was a means of hastening him sooner into heaven, if executed according to law.*

Now let us compare this with what our author has said: "Had Noah been as wicked as they were," viz. the Antediluvians, "he might have gone to heaven with them. But they being more vile than himself, had the advantage of him and went to heaven first. Therefore, the more wicked men are, the sooner they many times get through with their troubles, and the sooner they get to heaven." This is literally true of the converted murderer just noticed; and hence our author's argu-

* The murderer of PAUL ROUX, who was executed in Baltimore (July 1845,) himself said in his dying moments, that he believed the very murder he had committed would be the means of his eternal salvation. And he had been taught so to believe by his AT-TENDING CLERGYMAN.

ment turns against himself. And it has only *seeming* force when aimed against Universalism, but *real* force when aimed against his doctrine.

There is something morally instructive in the catastrophe of the deluge, when viewed in its proper light. The scriptures throughout represent that God took away the people of the old world *because* they were wicked. This fact is of itself conclusive evidence that God was *opposed* to their wickedness, and effected this change for their good that they should sin no longer. But how did this change mend the matter if God took them away to perpetuate their sin and rebellion against him to all eternity? How unacceptably would it sound in your ears to say he took them away *because they were wicked*, in wrath thrust them down to an endless hell because he was *displeased* with their wickedness, and yet keep them there where they must inevitably remain wicked under a load of Omnipotent wrath as long as eternity itself endures! How entirely unlike the instruction of the prophets and apostles upon this subject. Speaking of the Sodomites, the Lord, by the prophet Ezekiel, (16:50) says: "Therefore I took them away as I saw good." Hence it was in goodness that the Lord took them away. And is it not true also of the Antediluvians, that he took them away for good and not for evil? Goodness will always plead in commendation of the act, as it aims at an interior end, but the spiritual elevation and moral improvement of all. And

here let me quote the language of our author: "An exercise of mind which aims to promote an inferior good without reference to the good of the system, is not benevolence." Who will contend that "the good of the system" requires that nine-tenths of God's intelligent offspring shall be dashed down to regions of interminable despair, to wail on through an eternity of pain, tossed upon the tempestuous waves of hell's molten sea, while the other one-tenth will ascend to God, to regions of ineffible bliss? Will not this be promoting "an inferior good"? (if indeed there be any good in it,) to curse the majority that the few might be blessed! I rejoice that it is not in my heart to cherish such a "benevolence" as this. When God took away the Antediluvians and Sodomites, &c., he did it for *their* good as well as the good of others. He stopped them in their mad career, and said in truth, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther"—here shall the tempest of wrath and the heaving billows of sin be stayed. They were called to lay down their arms—to ground the weapons of their rebellion and descend where "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest; where the prisoners rest together, and hear not the voice of the oppressor; where the small and great are, and the steward is free from his master." Job 3:17—19. If two of your neighbors were seen together in a quarrel, threatening to destroy each other's lives with sword in hand upraised to strike the fatal blow, a good and benevolent

man would hasten to them with alacrity and wrest from them the deadly instrument. This would be a praiseworthy act and commended by all the just. So God, who is good and benevolent, visited those ancient people, and with the hand of death wrested from them the weapons of their rebellion that they should neither hurt nor destroy any more. Therefore God interposed as he saw good—he “who is wonderful in counsel and excellent in working”—“who doeth great things and unsearchable; marvellous things without number—who disappointeth the devices of the crafty, so that their hands cannot perform their enterprise.”

That God designed the future good of those ancient people, hear what the Lord said by the prophet Ezekiel, 16:53, “When I shall bring again their captivity, the captivity of Sodom and her daughters, and the captivity of Samaria and her daughters, then will I bring again the captivity of thy captives in the midst of them.” This prophecy clearly points out a time when those people shall be restored to the blessings of freedom, when tyranny and oppression shall fall—when all the nations and kindreds and families of the earth are blessed in Christ, and there is “none to hurt or destroy in all God’s holy mountain.”

When we look at this catastrophe of the flood, we should not take a one sided view, or narrow down our conceptions to one point; but take a large and comprehensive survey of that most wonderful event, and con-

sider the taking away of human life but one branch of a great and all wise purpose in view. "Intelligence like that which has formed the universe amid which we are existing, employs its boundless powers with as much wisdom and goodness when it alters, as when it constructs. We may therefore be certain that it effected this great revolution in its human world as an improvement in its condition, as an advancing stage of its grand process; for the benefit of those who were afterward to inhabit it; and as an assistant to the progression of human nature at large. As death, without any assignment of a fixed mode or time of dying, was made the law to all human life; the removal of the existing population by an overwhelming flood, was no other alteration of the previous course of things, than the causing all those to die at the same time and at that particular time, who would have inevitably departed at some subsequent, though varying periods. It brought no more death into the world than had been before attached to it. It only caused the individual termination to occur earlier to the existing race than would have happened without it."—*Turner's Sacred History*.

Let us ever be inclined to revere the wisdom and goodness of our Author in this great event of his providence. Let us view him as an ever active, ever presiding Deity, who is carrying on in the various processes of his government, a scheme far transcending in goodness and wisdom our most exalted conceptions, and love and adore him forever.

LECTURE VI.

What I shall say in this lecture will be chiefly in reference to the nature and object of punishment. Our author has attacked with some degree of earnestness the "Restoration Scheme" as he is pleased to call it, which maintains that those who die in a state of wickedness will be punished hereafter with that amount of punishment which is proportioned to their deserts, which punishment is limited, disciplinary in its nature, and will end when the reformation of the sinner is wrought out.

Our author seems to have no confidence in this scheme, and thinks he sees strong objections to the idea that punishment is disciplinary in its nature. Says he, "To show the absurdity of this scheme, it may be observed, 1st, that God will not punish the wicked in hell after they repent and reform; for the end of punishment will have been obtained. Yet at the same time it is strenuously maintained that he will inflict on them all the punishment they deserve,—all that inflexible justice requires." But he has fallen into a sad mistake with regard to the views of those he opposes. For they contend that God will inflict on them *all* the punishment they deserve, and all that inflexible justice requires; yet at the same time they maintain that they deserve no more and inflexible justice requires no more than what is exactly necessary to produce the *reformation designed*. What does justice inflict punishment

for? For the reformation of the punished. When therefore reformation is obtained justice is satisfied, it has no demands beyond it, its object is accomplished, and hence it must cease its stripes, for to continue them would be *positive injustice*. And here I will quote our author's own language confirming this statement. Says he, "What is termed disciplinary punishment, has in view nothing more than the good of the offender—his repentance. When this is accomplished, punishment must cease." This is exactly in accordance with our reasoning, and I would defy him to refute his own arguments in our own favor. But he continues:—"The parent who chastises the disobedient child, commences the painful operation in view of the child's good; and the instant he perceives in him sufficient indication of repentance and a disposition to return to duty, he lays aside the rod,—he has no further use for it—the end is obtained. So if the punishment of the wicked in hell be of the same nature, it will cease the instant they become penitent, whether they receive their deserts or not." This latter phrase, "Whether they receive their deserts or not," is a false assumption. This reasoning is all good till he comes to that, and here he supposes a sentiment which no man believes. And further, it is refuted in the supposed case of the parent's punishing the disobedient child. He says "the parent chastises in view of the child's good." I ask, if he does so, does he not act in accordance with the principle of jus-

tice? Most surely. Well, then, does not the child receive all his deserts when he receives all that justice demands and justice is satisfied? Verily, for justice can demand no more than is good for the child. Now let me suppose a case: A man is very sick—he sends for a physician—the physician comes—he administers a certain amount of medicine and waits to see the result. If it does not produce the desired effect, the disease being more obstinate than he was aware of, he administers more. This produces the desired effect. The obstinacy of the disease is overcome. Would it be reasonable to administer more, or continue to increase the amount after the disease was conquered and the end for which it was given was obtained? No. Supposing he should continue to add to the quantity and pour down dose after dose, after he had conquered the disease, and the patient was being fast restored; you would object to it as unjust, and would inquire of him why he ~~done~~ *did* it! He would reply perhaps, “I am only vindicating the claims of justice. Justice would require me to cut him down and not let him live at all. And further, if it had its full demands it would not only let the sick suffer here but take them away and make them endlessly sick hereafter. For the creed says we are “made liable to all the miseries of this life, to death itself and to the pains of hell forever.” Does any man suppose that justice requires any more than is sufficient to produce restoration? If the parent in the exercise of

strict justice seeks the good, the reformation of his child when he chastises, then justice is satisfied when the object is obtained, and has no further demands. This must be plain to every man of common sense. Our author himself says, the parent chastises in view of the child's good. I agree with him. The parent has some good object to produce by the chastisement which he inflicts, and if he be wise he will inflict no more than what is necessary to produce the object designed, and when that object is obtained justice is satisfied and the rod is withheld. If his sentiment be true that the parent chastises in view of the child's good, shall we rob God of the character of a parent by attributing to him a contrary design? He says on page 69, "That the punishment of the damned is not for their good." The fair inference from this is, that God is not a Parent, for a "*parent* chastises in view of the child's good." What character would he impute to his heavenly Author, if not that of a parent? Would he that of a savage and a tyrant? Surely he would, if his language does not deceive us, for that plainly implies this.

If I understand our author he discards in toto the idea of *disciplinary* punishment being connected with the government of God, *which* punishment he says "has in view nothing more than the good of the offender—his repentance." But he believes in a *vindictive* punishment, which, says he, "has no direct reference to the good of the offender: it looks higher, at the pub-

lic good; is designed to vindicate a violated law; to sustain a law by which the public good is secured." In *such* a punishment, a punishment "which has no direct reference to the good of the offender," he believes, and strives most ardently to defend it. But why? why does he discard disciplinary punishment from the government of God and attach a vindictive punishment? The reason is obvious, it was fatal to his creed to argue that God would administer disciplinary punishment, which has in view the good of the offender. So he must maintain his creed at all events, even at the expense of charging God with inflicting a "vindictive punishment which has no direct reference to the good of the offender." Verily, creeds are sometimes stubborn things, and make their adherents *inconsistent*, as well as miserable. Hence our author says, "If we give up this position," viz., that God's punishment is vindictive," and take the other, that their punishment is disciplinary,—designed for their good—to be an antidote for sin—and is administered just as a physician deals out an unpleasant medicine to secure the health of his patient, then it is not what they deserve and justice requires." We do not think so, but the reverse, viz., that it *is* what they deserve and justice requires, for we cannot believe that God will administer an undeserved and unjust punishment. But he would do so most *assuredly* if he administered a *vindictive* punishment which has no direct reference to the good of the offender.

We most heartily agree with our opponent that "disciplinary punishment has in view nothing more than the good of the offender," *NOTHING MORE, good and good only*, for it cannot have a mixture of good and evil, or of evil only and evil interminably. So that he has fairly beat himself. His sayings have turned directly against him. He has admitted all for which I contend.

Again he says, "The punishment of the wicked in another world must be either *vindictive*—designed to sustain a violated law, and to be what they deserve,—or it must be *disciplinary*—adapted to their good, to bring them to repentance. It must be exclusively one or the other: it cannot be both."

Here you will perceive that he discards from the government of God all disciplinary punishment.

But how does he prove that the punishment of the wicked in another world is not disciplinary? He has not advanced a single argument, or the shadow of an argument, and for this best of all reasons, he could not. He had nothing to build an argument upon. Though he asserts with seeming confidence that vindictive punishment will be administered, yet he asserts it without any proof. Now for my own part, if I maintained future punishment, it would be disciplinary punishment, and that alone; and that it was disciplinary in its nature, I would prove from the nature of God and his character as revealed to us in the scriptures. That this is the nature of punishment can be proved, but that it is

vindictive, having "no direct reference to the good of the offender," *cannot be proved*. He says that this punishment is "either *vindictive* or *disciplinary*," and I will leave it to the good sense of this assembly to decide which (on the supposition that there is punishment in the future life) God will inflict. You will all of you say that reason, benevolence, and goodness would be in favor of *disciplinary* punishment. If so, you can say in the language of our author, "If the punishment of the wicked in hell be of the same nature, it will cease." Now let us have a little proof that punishment is disciplinary. Heb. 12: 9—11. "We have had fathers of our flesh which corrected us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits, and live? For they verily for a few days chastened us after their own pleasure; but he [the Father of spirits] for our profit, that we might be partakers of his holiness. Now no chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous: nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."—Here was "*profit*" to be experienced. and "*fruit*" to be produced, viz: the partaking of the holiness of God. Will Mr. Stearns attempt to find scripture to refute this? Can he find a *single passage* which asserts that God does not punish the guilty for their good? or that supports his doctrine of "*vindictive punishment*?"—Hear Solomon: "The rod and reproof give wisdom.

Correct thy son and he shall give thee rest." Prov. 29: 15, 17. Again : "Withhold not correction from the child : for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." Prov. 23: 13, 14. Does Mr. S. believe this doctrine ? Does he maintain that the punishment which God will inflict upon the disobedient will deliver a "soul from hell ?" No. He maintains with much earnestness and with all the eloquence he is master of, that no souls ever can possibly be delivered from hell—they must remain there to all eternity, without any hope of deliverance. There is no fact more clearly set forth than that God administers chastisements in love and for the purpose of delivering men from their sinful desires and hellish practices, or from the horrible pit of moral corruption, that they might be made partakers of God's holiness.

This is the uniform sentiment of the scriptures. Solomon said, "Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even *as a father* the son in whom he delighteth." Now compare this with what our author has said in reference to the dealings of the parent with his child, and you will have the truth of these remarks confirmed by the words of his own mouth. And hence he has furnished us with proof that if there be future punishment it must be disciplinary, and says he, such punishment must cease, after the object for which it was inflicted has been obtained.

Let us notice another expression of his. Says he, "If the punishment of the damned be disciplinary, then when they leave this world they will enter the sure path to heaven." I would ask what other path they would enter to go to heaven besides a *sure* one? Is there any other path to enter there? They must enter such a path and such only to get to heaven. But supposing when men leave this world they will enter the sure path to heaven: has our author any objection? Does he not labor now himself to place men in the sure path to heaven? Is not this the object and the constant prayer of his heart? If so, can he have any objection that God shall take the work out of his hands and complete it, which he himself could not accomplish? Surely not, and instead of this circumstance favoring him or his doctrine, it is directly and weightily against him.

He says on the supposition that punishment is disciplinary, "The curse of the law which the punished must suffer in hell will not be an evil, (and who will contend that God will ever inflict an evil as such) but a great good"—[And this agrees with his own argument concerning the conduct of the parent toward the child.] "Jehovah can bestow upon them no greater good while they remain sinful, than to administer to them this sovereign remedy." Well, as there is no lack of goodness in God, it is his nature to bestow goodness always, knowing that the goodness of God leadeth to repentance, as the scriptures testify. And as

it regards the sovereign remedy of which he speaks, I suppose he will have no objection to God's administering a sovereign remedy for sin, for he has attempted to administer a sovereign "Antidote to the doctrine of Universal Salvation," one of the greatest evils in his imagination that ever reigned upon earth. And now if he could be successful by this "antidote" in removing every vestige of this evil from the world, he would rejoice and think he had been doing God-service. And therefore, I know of no good reason why he should not rejoice, if God himself should "administer a sovereign remedy" for removing all evil from the universe. And I am not entirely without hope that he will yet see the propriety of advocating, that God will administer such a remedy—that he will be as good and even better than he, and much more efficacious in carrying out what he considers a good work till it is finished and all error and evil is overcome. For he even says on the supposition that punishment is disciplinary, &c., "Then we may preach to impenitent men, if you die in your sins, though you cannot go where Christ is now, yet God, your offended Maker and Judge, will set your feet in the road that will lead to him:" (and will not Mr. Stearns strive to do the same to men now?) "he will place you under a fatherly discipline which will bring you to repentance and prepare you for that world where Jesus is: he will put you under the most effectual means of grace: means which you cannot resist."—

(Has Mr. S. any objection? and would he not do the same if in his power?) "Now," continues he, "let reason decide whether there be any wrath, any indignation, any curse, in that which will absolve and purify men from sin, and prepare them for the endless felicities of heaven?" I reply: there can be in God towards his creatures no wrath, no indignation, no curse, but that which springs from love. And all the means he employs for preparing men for the felicities of heaven, are dictated by love. For love is the crowning attribute of his nature and seeks the ultimate and endless good of all.

Again our author says, "If Christ redeems some men, I beg to know, in view of this scheme, from what does he redeem them?" The answer is a very plain one, and I am sorry that he had not discernment enough to see it. The answer is in Matt. 1: 21: "He shall save his people from their sins." Sin is therefore that enemy from which Christ came to save. But there is as much of a query in my mind, if our author's views of man's nature be correct, *what* is saved, as there is in his mind *from* what a man is saved. For says he, "The scriptures represent the heart by nature as *totally* destitute of moral goodness. Such is the nature of man's heart: it contains nothing good." Now I would like to have him tell us what is saved—that which "contains nothing good?" *What*, I repeat, is there to be saved? a lump of absolute vanity and worthlessness, *a perfect* embodiment of refined, concentrated, and un-

mixed depravity ? If, as he says, the heart is *totally* destitute of moral goodness, and contains *nothing* good, what good shining quality is there to be saved, and what is that surrounding corruption from which it is saved ? as salvation pre-supposes a deliverance from something. If the heart contains *nothing* good, you will plainly perceive there is nothing good to be saved. And of course, if salvation is granted at all, it is a salvation of that which has nothing good in it. Not a very desirable salvation, truly ! and the hope of which is not very valuable. Let Mr. Stearns extricate himself from this dilemma if he can. Salvation pre-supposes something good that is to be saved, and something evil the deliverance from which is the salvation. Hence his theory is directly opposed to and contradicted by the whole system of salvation as taught in the scriptures.

He speaks of a change necessary to fit man for heaven. But what can be made out of total corruption ? You may change it, and change it, it will remain total corruption still, for no good can be evolved from it.

He asks how this change, necessary to fit man for heaven, is produced ? "Not by punishment," says he. "This is not God's method of renewing the heart. It has no such adaptation, and consequently no such tendency." What ! the punishment which our kind Father in heaven will inflict is not adapted to produce reformation, and has no such tendency ? I cannot believe it. It would betray in me unworthy views of

God to believe it. But our author, as if reckless of consequences and ignorant of the force of language, adds, "Punishment tends to harden the wicked in sin." I know of no punishment that has this tendency, unless it be endless punishment, and this has had a tendency to harden the wicked in sin, as all past history demonstrates. Elihu, Job's friend, entertained a very different view from our author upon the nature of divine punishment, for he says, "Surely it is meet to be said unto God, I have borne chastisement, *I will not offend any more.*" Here the divine chastisement did not tend to harden *his heart*. Our author contradicts the old proverb, "He that spareth the rod spoileth the child." But according to his view, he who *applieth* the rod spoileth the child.

Again, he quotes that oft repeated expression in Prov. 29: 1, as an argument against Universalism, "He that being often reprov'd, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed and that without remedy." He says there is a palpable contradiction between this text and the sentiment of Universalism, because this doctrine says there is a remedy, But a remedy for what? Let us understand the text, and not be too hasty in our decision, as he has been, and misapply it. He supposes the text to have reference to our future immortal condition, and that death seals that condition without the possibility of a remedy. This supposition is *entirely* without foundation. Supposing I should say of a

man, he has got the consumption, and he must die, there is no remedy :—would any man suppose that I meant this victim of consumption must be miserable in a future state ? All that can be made out of the passage, is, that death is inevitable—man must die—there is no remedy. “ They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches ; none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him,—that he should still live forever and not see corruption.” Ps. 49 : 6, 7, 9.—“ There is no man who hath power over the spirit, to retain the spirit ; neither hath he power in the day of death ; and there is no discharge in that war : neither shall wickedness deliver those who are given to it.”—Ecc. 8 : 8. See also Prov. 6 : 15, and 2 Chron. 36 : 16, 17.

Again : speaking upon the subject of punishment, he says in reference to the passage, “ All things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose,” that “ the fair inference is, that all things do *not* work together for *good* to those who do *not* love God. Their punishment, therefore is not for their good.” I object to any such inference being drawn from the passage. It is unwarrantable and unjust, and arose from a misconstruction and misapplication of the passage. Besides, what is said in it about punishment ? Nothing. What is said about final good—good in a future state ? Nothing.

hence the text has nothing in it favorable to his view. The meaning of it is plainly this, and it was spoken in reference only to "the called," the disciples and apostles of Jesus:—namely: Those great and constant afflictions and trying persecutions which "the called" or the chosen disciples endured, were through God to work out for them some latent good. Those who loved God and were truly and properly enlightened by the gospel, could see good growing out of evil. The wrongs they endured and the heavy persecutions they bore would be overruled for some wise end, and would "work together for" the "good" of the cause which they had espoused. Hence Paul to the Philippians, first chapter, after speaking of his confinement in the Roman palace, writes as follows:—"But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have *fallen out rather* unto the *furtherance of the gospel*: so that my bonds are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, *are much more bold* to speak the word without fear.—I know that this *shall turn to my salvation* through your prayer, and the supply of the spirit of Jesus Christ." To the mind of this apostle all those things meant for evil, furthered, rather than obstructed the gospel. They worked together for its advancement rather than its destruction: and thus God often causes "the wrath of man to praise him." This view of the

subject shows a consistency in the language under consideration, and avoids that erroneous sentiment expressed by our author, that *sometimes* God does not do good to his creatures, that he brings upon them that which is *not even designed for their good*. As he has said on page 69, "That the punishment of the damned is *not for their good*." But the scriptures declare that "God is good unto all."

Again: our author makes a distinction between chastisement and punishment: the former is inflicted on God's children only, and the latter upon the children of the devil, the wicked. He says, God brings chastisement upon his children, and "intends to promote their sanctification by it." If so, then the *tendency* of chastisement is to produce sanctification, and is *adapted* to this object. Can he tell us then why it will not have this tendency and adaptation when applied to any other member of the human family? Does God bring upon his creatures one kind of suffering which will infallibly result in good and good only, and another kind entirely opposed to this, resulting in evil and evil only? This is his doctrine, and he has plainly asserted it. For says he, "Punishment is of a different character," that is, it differs from chastisement which promotes sanctification. "It is a curse, a dreadful curse, and will tend to sustain God's righteous government, by an infliction of positive pain upon the transgressor."

Hearer, do you realize the full force and meaning of this expression? What! I exclaim with deepest astonishment, a *positive* "CURSE," without any mixture of good, "*will tend to sustain God's righteous government!*" What christian heart is prepared to adopt this sentiment? And who *can* do it, and at the same time love God and respect his government? You may call that a "righteous government" which is "sustained" by such "a curse," but reasonable men, especially those of benevolent hearts, will be slow to believe it. You may put light for darkness and darkness for light, or put error for truth, and evil for good, but the world never will applaud you for consistency.

Supposing the President of these United States should introduce a positive curse to sustain the government.— You would treat him as a mad man and an enemy.— Well, in what light shall we view God and his government, if he introduce a positive evil, and endless curse, to sustain it? Shall we call it righteous, as our author does, with such a curse attached to it? It would be a contradiction of terms—a blasphemous mockery. Has God laid himself under the absolute necessity of inflicting upon men a positive and endless evil, in order "to sustain" his righteous government? What think you? Do you think he has? It seems to me you cannot; you have better views of your heavenly Father and his government. The torments which God *will* inflict and *does* inflict, are designed for some ultimate

good, as I have all along proved. But our author says, "They will have no such tendency. They are vindictive and interminable." This he conceives to be the necessary character of punishment, necessary to sustain the righteous government of God. But we would think more reasonably, that it is necessary to sustain an unrighteous government. Punishment inflicted merely for the sake of pain and without designing the good of the punished, is revenge, and consistent only with the character of a tyrant. All pain that has no benevolent end in view, is cruelty, and therefore cannot vindicate the divine law nor sustain God's righteous government.

I like the sentiment of the late Rev. Robert Hall, though a believer in the doctrine of ceaseless pain, as expressed in these words:

"The infliction of every species of punishment is out of place, which has no tendency to reform the offender, or to benefit others by his example; which are its own legitimate ends. Whatever is beside these purposes, is a useless waste of suffering, wholly condemned by the dictates of reason and religion." Now if the only "*legitimate ends of punishment* are to *reform the offender*, or to *benefit others* by his example," how can it be proved that the infliction of endless torment will produce these legitimate ends,—how are these purposes secured? "The case is plain, that if God makes any man endlessly miserable, it must be an act

of unqualified *revenge*, since it is intended to produce incalculable evil to the suffer, but no good to any being in the universe."

I will notice one expression more of our author, and come to a close. He observes that for the righteous, "Christ has magnified the law and made it honorable, and satisfied the demands of justice for them." Let us admit this, and another expression of his by the side of it. He says, "all men justly deserve to be endlessly miserable, yet Christ died in the sinner's stead, and satisfied the demands of justice, and paid the debt due to every sinner." Now you will perceive if justice is fully satisfied, no man can be endlessly miserable, for she has no more demands, unless a demand is in force after it is paid. She has no more claims beyond what she has received—she is fully paid, and hence she must forever hereafter hold her peace, and the doctrine of endless pain must fall to the ground. So mote it be, to the everlasting glory of God and the joy of angels.

LECTURE VII.

In the introduction of this lecture, I am to make some remarks upon the subject of forgiveness. It seems in the mind of our author a strange doctrine that *God should forgive sins, and yet punish men for those*

sins. I trust he has no clear views of the scripture doctrine of forgiveness. To my mind there is nothing marvelous in the idea of God's punishing the sinner, and yet forgiving his sins. Punishment and forgiveness are not antagonistic, as he would have us believe: they both have the same end in view—both are but branches of the same government which God exercises over the sinner for good.

I trust I can make this subject plain to you all. Parent, you have a disobedient child, and wish his reformation. In order to bring him back to the path of obedience you apply the rod, and when you see sufficient indication of his reform and your object is obtained, you withhold the rod, and extend forgiveness by receiving him as one restored. Hence punishment and forgiveness agree in the same object, the former necessarily precedes the latter and prepares the way for its application and completing the work. It does not oppose but aids her in reclaiming the wayward. It does not say to forgiveness, you have no right to my subjects and never can have—I will not relinquish my claim and yield to your entreaty—I have no sympathy with you or fellowship for you. No: but both joined together “in the unity of the spirit.” embrace one great object, the reformation of the disobedient. So also God can punish, and yet extend forgiveness to his disobedient children. We have scripture proof. David, speaking of the children of Israel, says, “Thou wast a God

that forgavest them, though thou tookest vengeance of their inventions." This text declares that God took vengeance (or inflicted punishment) upon them, and yet forgave them, hereby showing that punishment and forgiveness are not antagonistic. To the same import is another passage in Isa. 40: 2. "Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished, that *her iniquity is pardoned*: for she hath received of the Lord's hand double for all her sins."

But I will be a little more definite and minute in defining what forgiveness is, and on what condition it is extended. The original and scriptural meaning of the word is to remit, dismiss, or send out, and was used in reference to the act of sending out or curing a disease. Hence Christ said to the man possessed of deafness and dumbness, or, to the disease personified, which Mark calls a "foul spirit," "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit came out of him." Hence the disease was sent away, dismissed or sent out, so that the patient was no longer troubled with it. So it is with the morally diseased. When a man turns away from his evil practices, and resolves with his whole soul to live righteously before God, his mind is free from sin, from sinful desires and sinful motives, therefore, sin is dismissed and sent out, no longer to be remembered against him. Hence it is plain what the nature of that exercise of mind is which is connected with it.

givenness. One man sees another sincerely repent of his sins, and hears the prayer of contrition as it comes up from the depth of his soul that God would help him ever to live to his glory—and what are this man's feelings towards this humble penitent? The spirit of forgiveness and the tenderness of sympathy and compassion are in full exercise, and he would say to him, I dismiss and send out the sins of your heart—I do not retain them there by my feelings—I freely discharge them and let them go never more to be remembered against thee. Peace be unto thee.

Here you may perceive the *nature* of forgiveness, and the *condition* on which it is extended. You will also perceive that punishment does not oppose forgiveness, the one may be inflicted for the purpose of producing correction; and when this correction or improvement is obtained, forgiveness steps in, and sin is dismissed. This is the way in which God punishes and pardons. This was the way in which he dealt with the ancient Israelites. He punished them with captivity for their sins, and when they were corrected or reformed, pardon was extended.

The prophet foreseeing that God's purpose was founded in wisdom, and that it would infallibly be accomplished and the punishment of the Jews result in their good, said—"Thine own wickedness shall correct thee, and thy backslidings shall reprove thee." We believe that repentance and remission of sins will extend to all,

ere Christ shall give up the kingdom to the Father. We are encouraged thus to believe by the words of sacred writ. "Thy people also shall be willing in the day of thy power. Through the greatness of thy power shall thine enemies submit themselves unto thee." Ps. 110:3, 66:3. "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give *repentance* to Israel, and *forgiveness of sins*." Acts. 5:31. "Out of Zion shall come the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall *take away their sins*." Rom. 11:26, 27. "Behold the Lamb of God that *taketh away the sin of the world*." John 1:29. When, therefore, all sin shall be *taken away*, then forgiveness in the proper acceptance of the term will have been extended to all.

You will now perceive that we do not believe in the forgiveness of justly deserved punishment, a doctrine which is no where taught in the scriptures; but that we believe in the forgiveness of sin.

But Mr. Stearns says, "If men are punished for their sins, they are not pardoned; if they receive the punishment which they deserve, they are not saved from it. They are not saved at all. There is nothing from which to save them." Nothing? I am astonished that he could see nothing from which a man can be saved, unless it be justly deserved punishment! Had he read his bible carefully, we might suppose he would have seen something else. For there he would have found

It asserted that Christ "came to save his people from their sins." Sin, then, is that monster, that dreadful enemy, from which man is saved. It is the cause of suffering, and not the suffering itself alone which is to be taken away. And when the cause shall be eradicated and destroyed, the effect will cease. On no other principle is salvation granted to men. He says, "They are saved from punishment by an act of pardon. On this principle, the Lord saves his people." According to his reasoning the Lord does not save his people from their sins at all. Salvation does not reach sin, it extends to punishment and to that only. Hence a man may be saved from punishment, and yet be in full possession of sin, for ought we can gather from his theory. We believe in a salvation and forgiveness which reach to sin, the root and cause of man's wretchedness and misery; and consequently, when the tree of sin is uprooted and demolished it will cease to produce fruit.

Again: speaking in reference to the false idea that Restorationists believe in salvation from deserved punishment, he says, "If all men are saved from punishment, that from which they are saved they deserve. They are not therefore punished according to their deserts. They are saved from merited punishment. Can Universalism tell us what that punishment is; whether it be limited or endless?" I have in part answered this question already, and shall hereafter give it a fuller answer. Though it may be proper in this place to give

it a passing notice. This question will assume this shape. Can Universalism tell us what that punishment is which men receive, and yet are pardoned, whether it be limited or endless? The answer is a very plain one. If punishment is pardoned, it is of course limited, for pardon removes it. But he may say there would be no such thing as pardon unless there was a pardon of deserved punishment. And in this view of the subject the question would naturally arise, what is that deserved punishment, limited, or endless? Can Universalism tell? Yes. Universalism says limited, and she repeats the language of the author quoted last evening, that "Whatever punishment does not tend to reform the offender, or to benefit others by his example, is a useless waste of suffering, wholly condemned by the dictates of reason and religion."

Mr. Stearns says that men are not "brought to repentance by the punishment of hell. There is no such doctrine in the bible. Nothing of the kind intimated." Why then does he preach the doctrine of hell punishment, if the punishment of hell does not bring men to repentance? Surely he will not refrain from teaching this doctrine on the ground that it will not tend to produce this result, because he would forthwith be accused of leaning towards Universalism. If the personal and actual experience of hell's torments will not bring men to repentance, I cannot perceive how the *fear* of it simply, especially when it is a great way off, can

bring them to repentance. So according to our author's own admission, no good results can ever be derived from the creation of hell, either in time or in eternity, or from the doctrine concerning it as taught among men. I wish this all-important point to be remembered. If men are not "brought to repentance by the punishment of hell," by the actual experience of its pains, when there is no hope of escape; by what show of reason or argument can it be made to appear that the *fear* of its pains, the dreaded prospect of them at a distance, especially when there is a chance of escape, will have a reforming influence? The truth is, and cannot be disputed, that in order to be consistent with himself, Mr. Stearns should cease from this time forward to preach the doctrine of future hell torments, for the reason which he states, that men are not brought to repentance thereby.

Mr. John Newton Brown, decidedly one of the most learned men of his own denomination, has said, "It may be *safely* affirmed that endless punishment cannot be proved." We believe it. It is *safe* to affirm it. — The welfare of religion will not be endangered by it. Men can be brought to repentance without the doctrine. So according to these three witnesses, namely, Rev. Robert Hall, John Newton Brown, and Mr. Stearns, (and we are told that "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established,") it is plain that *merited* punishment is *limited*, for this can be followed

by reformation and forgiveness, but endless, never. Merited punishment is just that amount which is necessary to work out reformation or correct the offender; beyond this it would be cruelty, and no man merits cruelty from the hands of his Maker. When the object for which punishment is inflicted is accomplished, it must cease. And here I would bring in Mr. Stearns' own testimony to the truth of this remark. I delight in picking up his crumbs of truth. Says he, "The parent who chastises the disobedient child, commences the painful operation in view of the child's good; and the instant he perceives in him sufficient indication of repentance and a disposition to return to duty, *he lays aside the rod—he has no further use for it—the end is obtained.*" Hence he has answered his own question, and answered it so plainly that you cannot misunderstand. I will therefore leave this particular subject, and proceed to the examination of some remarks in the fourth chapter on "the demerit of sin."

He inquires most earnestly, "What punishment does sin deserve? What is its demerit?"—questions, important truly, and he says, "in the light of revelation, and no where else, must these questions be answered." But I am far from being satisfied that he has answered them in the light of revelation. He says, "It is not for us, depraved creatures, rebels against our Maker, to sit in judgment in this case; to define the nature of our conduct; to say what punishment we deserve." And yet

on the next page he says, even before he adduces any light from revelation, that "*sin deserves and will receive eternal punishment.*" On the next page following he says, "What must be the demerit of such a crime? *It is infinite, it deserves eternal punishment.* We all without distinction deserve "*eternal damnation.*"

Again: "The penalty of the law is an *infinite evil.* It is death—eternal death—the second death—the destruction of soul and body in hell," etc. etc. Verily, he seems now to know all about sin's demerit, and that he has a perfect right to define precisely what it is, notwithstanding he had just said, "It is not for us—to say what punishment we deserve." He has here boldly asserted that "we all without distinction" (and of course includes himself) deserve eternal damnation."

His first argument to prove this position is, that "sin is an offense committed against God." But this argument, if it has any force in it, refutes itself, because it makes man equal with God, which is a solecism; for if man can commit an infinite act which will produce infinite consequences, he must have infinite capacities, and therefore be equal with God. Who does not see the absurdity of this mode of argument at once? And besides, if a man by his sinful acts can demerit infinite punishment, by a parity of reasoning he may merit infinite felicity by his good acts, and claim it as his due. Supposing an individual should commit but two moral acts in his life, the one good and the other

evil—the one merits endless felicity, and the other demerits endless punishment; what will you do with him? “He has committed two infinite acts, and one deserves infinite consequences as much as the other. How will you reward him *according* to his deserts? There he stands, with neither reward nor punishment upon him, and equally deserving of both. What will you do with him? The moment you begin to punish him eternally you do violence to the demand of justice, which calls as loudly for the reward of endless felicity for his good act, as it does for the demerit of endless pain for his evil act. If you send him to heaven or hell, justice is violated and her demands eternally unsatisfied. If a man justly demerits infinite pain by his evil acts, then by the same mode of reasoning he can justly merit endless felicity for his good acts. And as you can not bestow both upon him, you must inevitably heap outrage upon justice and cheat her out of her demands to bestow either one upon him to the exclusion of the other. What then, I again ask, would you do with him? You can not thrust him down to hell, for heaven has demands upon him:—you can not exalt him to heaven, for hell has demands upon him, and if you hang him midway between heaven and hell, justice is still equally unsatisfied. What then can be done with him to have equal justice done? Perhaps you would divide him as it was proposed to do with the living child in the days of Solomon. But in this case justice would be only partially

satisfied, though I am not sure but that it will harmonize with a system of partial salvation very well—it could not with any other.

But I am happy to find him sometimes on the broad platform of truth. On page 56 he says, "The good of the system requires, that every person who opposes the law should be brought to justice and receive according to his doings." Yes, "the good of the system requires" this. But how is every man brought to justice who escapes the just punishment of his sins? And how does a man "receive according to his doings" if he is to be punished endlessly for all his bad deeds, (and our author says each one is infinite) and not rewarded at all for his good deeds? or, if he is rewarded with heaven for these and not punished at all for any of his bad ones? I can see no bringing men to *justice* in all this—nor can I perceive how a man can "receive according to his doings." "The good of the system" can never be secured upon the principle he has laid down, that *some* are rewarded for their good deeds and not punished for their bad ones, while others are not rewarded at all for their good deeds, but are punished for all their evils. This is not the way "that every man shall receive in his body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." This is not bringing every opposer of the law "to justice," that each may "receive according to his doings;" and therefore "the good of the system" is not promoted.

Again: man's acts being finite, I cannot perceive how he by receiving infinite punishment is dealt with according to his acts. This word "*according*," argues that man shall receive in *proportion* to the *magnitude* of his acts; and since his acts are finite, it follows of course that his punishment is limited. Hence our author's own language, when rightly interpreted, disproves his theory of the infinity of sin and of eternal rewards. And besides, it is a matter of no little astonishment that a man can commit an infinite act who is *totally depraved*! Do *infinite acts* come forth from absolute corruption? If so, then a totally depraved being possesses, one thing which Deity himself possesses—namely, a capability of *producing an infinite act*. This does not lack much of likening a totally depraved creature to the Supreme Being!

Another argument to prove the endless demerit of sin, which he adduces, is, that *sin is a violation of God's law*. I can see no force in this argument at all, and shall therefore pass it by with this brief remark upon it, namely, that in order for it to have any force, he must first prove that man (whom he calls totally depraved,) has infinite capacities—then his acts may be infinite, and demerit infinite consequences, when committed against an infinite God.

Another argument which he adduces, is, that "*sin is the opposite of holiness*." In order for this to have *any force*, the same proof must be given as before men-

sioned. In fact he has no proof in the whole chapter to support the endless demerit of sin.

He places great confidence in his argument built up on the atonement of Christ. He says, "The demerit of sin is in proportion to the worth of the atonement." But this is an assumption deduced from the false premise that sin requires an infinite atonement. This is proving a thing by a thing which needs to be proved. Or in other words, he assumes it as an established fact that sin is infinite, and hence supposes that an infinite atonement only can remove it. But how does he prove that the atonement of Christ is infinite? He attempts to prove it by "the infinite dignity of the Savior's character." He says that "Christ is truly and properly, God: so that as Mediator, he sustains the complex character of God-man." Again; "Jesus Christ is truly and properly Jehovah, equal in all respects with the Father." He says on page 41, Christ was the person tempted in the wilderness: he is, *therefore*, the Most High God. And yet on page 51 he says, in scripture language, "God can not be tempted with evil." Thus does he contradict himself in his eagerness to maintain a palpable absurdity. This God-man made an atonement. And the atonement must therefore be infinite, because it was made by a God-man. Why has he not made use of the same argument to prove that the material world is infinite? For he has told us that this same God-man made the world. If a thing is infinite be-

cause a God-man made it, then not only the atonement which he made is infinite, but every thing else which he has made, even man, and beast, and fowl, and creeping things. His argument in fact destroys itself.

Who was this God-man? I wish to know, for the scriptures mention no such being, and contain no such name. Was it "the Christ" who expired upon the cross? or the self-existent God? He would answer, *neither*, separately, but both united. Hence he says, "Although God, abstractly considered, did not suffer, yet Christ the Mediator, the God-man, did suffer."—Mark that. "*The God-man did suffer.*" This God-man is Jesus Christ, who is "equal in all respects with the Father." The conclusion is, God himself *suffered*! He bled upon a Roman cross and expired. "God hath purchased the church with *his own blood*," says he. "This blood is of infinite merit; by this the atonement was made." What an expression! The atonement was made by the blood of God!! God himself *SUFFERED*—and not only so, but also *DIED* an ignominious *death*!! To what strange inconsistencies and absurdities will not a man resort to support a sectarian opinion and defend a creed! If the language here used sounds rather too harshly, perhaps Mr. Stearns would like to modify it by saying that it was the *humanity* of Christ that suffered, and not abstractly God. Then it was not God who suffered and died at all.—*Perhaps* he will say that God and Christ were so united

that in some mystic sense what is true of one is true of the other also in the same thing, and hence neither of them suffered and died separately, but both of them did unitedly, and yet both were not two, but an indivisible one, and that one he calls "God-man." Verily, taking this altogether it is a strange contradiction of contradictions, amounting to this, that a thing is, and a thing is not, at the same time.

Was the humanity of Christ, which it is said suffered, was that the eternal God? Oh no: it will be said. Was the *spirit*, which he, while expiring upon the cross commended to his Father, was this the eternal God? No. What then, I ask was, if it was not the spirit or the humanity of Christ? What was it? Do we know of any thing more belonging to Christ than his body and his spirit? Do the scriptures inform us of any thing beside? If we say the spirit of Christ was God, mysteriously united to his humanity, then we virtually admit that God did not bleed or die, for the spirit did not die, but went to the Father, (which proves that it was not with the Father when with Christ) and it did not *bleed*, for to talk of spirit bleeding would be nonsense. Hence we have nothing now left in the argument but the *humanity* or body of Jesus Christ. Was this the eternal Father? It has been admitted that it was not, and yet it is that and that only which suffered, and bled, and died. Was there something infinite in that human body of flesh, which by its blood made an

infinite atonement? I do not, and can not see how an atonement can be made infinite by such means, and consequently can not perceive how the infinite demerit of sin can be made to appear from such flimsy arguments, as he has here adduced.

But supposing every sin demerits infinite punishment—then there are as many infinities as there are sins, and, therefore, all the sins in the universe put together, could not demerit more than infinite, and of course, not more than one single sin. This destroys all degrees in the magnitude of sin, and consequently all degrees in the severity of punishment. This doctrine seems to be plainly contradicted by scripture, which represents degrees of punishment, by the words “few stripes,” and “many stripes.” The words *few* and *many*, never, while the world stands, can be reconciled with infinite demerit or infinite punishment.

I shall now notice his argument in favor of eternal punishment drawn from the design of God in the system of salvation. He says, “Those who believe in the being and perfections of God, must admit, that in the system of salvation he has a *design*; that this design embraces one of two objects; either the salvation of all men, or the salvation of but a part. If God designs to save all men, all men will be saved; if he designs to save but a part, but a part will be saved. For information on this subject we are indebted exclusively to

the word of God. The question is not, whether, according to our notion of things it would be reasonable or unreasonable for God to save but a part, or the whole. It is simply this: What has God revealed?"

I do not altogether agree with him, neither do I believe he fully agrees with himself; for he lays it down as a principle of reason as well as scripture, that God has designed to save but a part. It has been a "question" with him from the beginning to the end of his pamphlet "whether it would be reasonable or unreasonable for God to save" all, or a part only. For myself, I believe God has "revealed" no system of salvation that is unreasonable. And I know he will agree with me, that a salvation which God has *designed*, is reasonable. For he has said, God has a design, and this design embraces either the salvation of all, or that of a part only. And says he, "If God designs to save all men, all men will be saved." In the fact, therefore, that God's design will not fail of accomplishment, he discovers a "reasonableness." So do I. Here, then, we are agreed. The only point of controversy now between us here, is, has God designed the salvation of *all*? He admits if God has, all will be saved. This would be reasonable. Now I have only to prove that God has designed the salvation of all, and the controversy between us, as regards the extent of salvation, is at an end. The scriptures are so full, so abundant in testimony in my favor, that I hardly know where to

commence quoting. I will refer you to Eph. 1:9, 10: "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he has purposed in himself. that in the dispensation of the fulness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." Here, though we have not the word *design*, yet we have words, "will," and "purpose," which must harmonize with God's design. Again in 1 Tim. 2:4, we read, "God will have all men to be saved and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." Is not this conclusive proof that God designs the salvation of all? Why should God will that which he has never designed? Again, in verse 6, "Who gave himself a ransom for all." Why this act if the ransom of all was not designed by the Father? Did he oppose the Father's design? Said he, "He that sent me is *with me*: the Father has not left me alone; for I *do always those things that please him*." John 8:29. The argument, therefore, is conclusive, that God designs the salvation of all. And says Mr. Stearns, "If God designs to save all men, all men will be saved."

He says also on the same page that: "The Father has given a part of the human family to Jesus Christ in an everlasting covenant with an express design that they shall be saved." If this is his express design with regard to a part of the human family given to Christ, *would it not also be his express design with regard to*

the whole human family if all were given to Christ? Surely... Hence it only remains to be proved on scripture authority that all were given to Christ. See John 3:35, and 17:2, "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "Thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to *as many as* thou hast given him." And Mr. S. says, "Those whom the Father has given to Christ in the everlasting covenant, are chosen or elected in him to salvation. This cannot be denied without throwing away the bible." True; and I have shown that all were given to Christ, that he should give eternal life to the same. All, therefore, who were given to him, were, as he says, "chosen or elected in him to salvation." I am not disposed to throw away my bible or deny this. No, there is too much truth in it, for me willingly to give it up. Paul to the Hebrews, speaking of the covenant of salvation, says, in the prophet's language, "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel... I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord; for *all shall know me*, from the least to the greatest." And this is life eternal, to know God in the sense here referred to, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent.

I cannot therefore, resist the overwhelming testimony

of the scriptures, that all were given to Christ in the covenant of salvation, and consequently were "chosen or elected in him to salvation," and such as are elected will be saved. Your attention is now invited to his argument drawn from the *justice* of God, in support of endless misery.

He says "Justice is an attribute of God." Very true: but according to his definition or theological view of justice it belongs not to the Supreme Being at all, but might more properly be ascribed to the devil. For it is represented as having no mercy, no compassion, no forgiveness, and even opposed to salvation and the future holiness and happiness of our race. It is said that no man living can be saved on the principle of justice. What is this but arraying justice against salvation? But, all Unitarians admit that every one of God's attributes except justice is in favor of salvation, and even universal salvation. Now admitting this true, what follows? It follows that every attribute, every perfection of God's nature is against this author's argument for eternal punishment built on justice. How weak then that argument when compared with the overwhelming argument in favor of the opposite doctrine. The case stands thus, according to his reasoning: justice only is in favor of eternal punishment, while wisdom, goodness, holiness, mercy and love are opposed to it. Now here are so many witnesses; whose testimony will you receive? Will you receive the testimony of one

and reject the five? If you build an argument on the united testimony of the five exclusively, then the strength of your argument against endless punishment is as five to one. Hence, the most we can say logically in favor of our author's argument, is, that it is a weak one, if built alone on his sense of God's justice. But does God's justice necessarily require eternal punishment? It is assumed, not proved that it does. But I answer, *no*. God can possess no attribute which will keep up an eternal warfare against his wisdom, goodness, holiness, mercy and love. And besides, justice can not be inconsistent with itself. If it favored and promoted endless disobedience, it certainly would not punish men for being disobedient. And that (on this hypothesis of endless suffering,) justice does favor endless disobedience, is evident from the fact that eternal punishment prevents a return to obedience, making reconciliation and the enjoyment of holiness absolutely impossible. Now this view would show that justice is inconsistent with itself. It condemns and approves at the same time. If then, as he admits, and all of us admit, that the punishment which justice may inflict is an evidence that justice is opposed to sin, surely his argument for eternal punishment built on the justice of God, refutes itself. If justice be an attribute of God, and its punishment a proof that it is opposed to sin, then justice can never so oppose itself as to place man in a state of eternal sinning. How then can there be an

argument drawn from the *justice* of God in favor of eternal punishment? There can be none.

But he very truthfully remarks on page 53, that "The justice of God, is that attribute which influences him in all cases to do right. As it relates to his dealings with individuals, it is usually termed distributive justice. It takes cognizance of men's moral characters, and rewards or punishes them according to their merits or demerits. In this sense, God is just. As the Governor of the universe, he will reward the righteous according to their works; and he will punish the wicked according to their crimes. Should he fail to do either, in a single instance, he would be unjust." This is all very true. But mark the expression: "If God fail in a *single* instance, to reward the righteous and punish the wicked according to their works, he is unjust." And yet on page 12, he says, "If we had our deserts we should all be consumed. We should be denied all favor and cut down like an unfruitful tree." This is virtually saying that God has not dealt with men according to their works. And if he has not, even in only one "single instance," then according to his admission God is unjust. And if justice itself has failed "in a single instance," then it may in *every* instance, and consequently his argument built upon it has failed. It is weak and worthless, and unconvincing. Who would think of building an argument in support of any doctrine upon a foundation that is liable to fail? That

must be an uncertain doctrine, resting on such foundation. Such we believe to be the doctrine of eternal punishment. This author has labored throughout his whole book to show that what he calls God's justice will withhold deserved punishment from a part of mankind, that in innumerable instances, instead of a "single instance," justice will not punish according to desert. If the fact of God's doing so, makes Him unjust, as my opponent has stated; then it is equally true that if *justice* does so it becomes injustice, and this is the very principle from which he has deduced the doctrine of eternal punishment, as his own reasoning has clearly proved. A bad cause can be sustained only by bad means.

That justice which will not punish the righteous for the long catalogue of darkest crimes which they may have committed prior to their becoming righteous—that justice which will not reward the wicked for the many good deeds they may have performed in life—that justice which selects an *innocent* person, God's beloved Son, and pours out upon him all the punishment that all men in all past ages ever did deserve, or ever will in all coming ages deserve—pours out upon him all the vials of infinite wrath, not merely *temporal* but *ETERNAL* punishment—that justice, which, notwithstanding all this amount of suffering has been endured, yet sternly demands that the same amount ought yet to be re-endured by each individual of the human race, and some

shall positively endure it—that justice which was once satisfied with infinite sufferings, and yet with insatiate thirst calls for more—or, which once received the payment of its demands in full, and yet eternally sues for more, and making such demands now that God himself can never pay in full—that justice which casts no look of compassion or mercy towards the erring creatures of humanity, nor throws around them the mantle of hope—that justice which as Watts says,

“ has built a dismal hell
And laid her stores of vengeance there,”

THAT justice, dear hearers, is the justice on which my opponent has built his argument for eternal punishment. *That* is the foundation on which this “doctrine of infinite importance,” as he is pleased to call it, rests. Surely, such punishment and such justice ought to go together, as they both have one nature and one origin, and are both opposed to all that is glorious and lovely in heaven and in earth.

We now leave Mr. Stearns in the full possession of all the glory and satisfaction derivable from this principle of justice as set forth by himself, and from the doctrine of eternal pain which rests upon it.

LECTURE VIII.

This lecture will embrace in the beginning an examination of the argument drawn from the *benevolence* of God in favor of eternal punishment. Mr. Stearns introduces his argument in these words, "God is love. He is love, or benevolence, itself. With those who advocate the doctrine of universal salvation, this is a favorite topic." Well, why should it not be? Is there any thing wrong in it? Lives there a christian on earth with whom the love or benevolence of God is not "a favorite topic?" I thank him for this complimentary remark, and for the high honor he has bestowed upon us in publishing this fact to the world. I would to God that all professing christians would make it more a "favorite topic" than they do. It is peculiarly our joy to meditate on the love of God, to talk of it, to sing of it, and hope in it. It is *now* our topic, which fact shows that our hearts are inclined to the side of goodness, and that we delight in the things that are most excellent. It will eternally be our highest cherished topic when the things of time are passed away, for all heaven will be radiant with its glory, when every heart and voice in concert joined shall "sing that God is love."

Again, he says, speaking of this benevolence, "It is the source whence they draw their most plausible arguments to support their system." Our arguments

are not only "*most plausible*," but are *real, forcible, irrefutable* and *scriptural*. If this author concedes to us the honor of drawing our arguments from the *love or benevolence* of God, he has done himself justice, and the world will applaud him for his candor.

But are not the arguments drawn from the benevolence of God in support of the doctrine, more valid, and more to the credit of the heart and head of the believer in the doctrine, than the arguments of my opponent are to his heart and head, which he has drawn from a principle that is opposed to the love of God, a principle which has no salvation to grant, no forgiveness to impart, no mercy to exercise? for such is the principle, as I have shown in a former lecture, from which he has labored to draw an argument for the doctrine of eternal agony. I rejoice that we are found following Benevolence in her untiring labors for universal peace. I thank him for the truth he has conceded to us.

Again, we find him expressing other and more truths in his introduction. He has laid down a foundation which is consistent with all the principles of revealed truth. In defining the benevolence of God, he truly says, "The benevolence of God is that attribute which influences him in all his operations, to aim at his own declarative glory in promoting the highest possible good of the moral system. God's declarative glory and the good of the moral system, are inseparably connected: one implies the other." This is all very true.

And it is strange to me, that he should draw such conclusions as he has in favor of endless misery, from such premises, or that both of us arguing from the same premises should arrive at entirely different results: *he* drawing the conclusion that God's benevolence will pour out upon countless myriads of human being the streams of eternal woe, of infinite indignation and ceaseless wrath; and *I* the conclusion that God's benevolence, [itself universal] will seek unflinchingly the immortal blessedness of every sentient being.

If it be true, as this author has admitted, that "the benevolence of God aims at his own declarative glory and the highest possible good of the moral system," I can not perceive how he can reconcile this benevolence with the endless cruelty of a portion of mankind.—Does "the highest possible good of the moral system" consist in the indescribable, inconceivable, and endless agony of some of God's offspring? If this is benevolence, I beg to know what would be cruelty? But this author contends that it is pure benevolence, the benevolence of *God*, of that good Being who seeks the highest good of all! What a thankless and comfortless task must that have been for him to sit down to write, while really and heartily believing his sentiment upon this subject! Not a single ray of comfort could have penetrated his mind—all must have been cheerlessness and gloom around him; not the least imaginable satisfaction could he find, or the smallest degree of

encouragement to respect that benevolence. His mind must have been filled with torture of the most agonizing character, unless his conscience was seared, or insensible to every refined feeling of humanity. Lo, he himself candidly confesses on page 21, that "No man can be happy in the midst of scenes and objects with which he is not pleased." While he was penning his views upon this doctrine, his whole mind, and feelings, and thoughts, in fact the whole mental man, must have been "in the midst of scenes and objects" which were not pleasing, and therefore he must have been unhappy, according to his own admission. He must have felt as the celebrated Saurin said he did. Said he, "I sink—I sink under the awful weight of my subject; and I declare, when I see my friends, my relations—the people of my charge—this whole congregation—when I think that I, that you, that we are all threatened with these torments—when I see in the lukewarmness of my devotions, in the languor of my love, in the levity of my resolutions and designs, the least evidence, though it be only presumptive, of my future misery, yet I find in the thought a mortal poison which diffuseth itself into every period of life, rendering society tiresome, nourishment insipid, pleasure disgustful, and life itself a cruel bitter! I cease to wonder that the fear of hell hath made some men mad, and others melancholy."

This is one of the most pathetic and candid acknowl-

edgments that I have ever known to come from the pen or lips of any man. It portrays most vividly the torments of the mind that dwells intently upon the subject. But Saurin is not alone. Other minds have felt and will continue to feel the same torments that lay with such crushing weight upon his mind. Hence Dr. Dwight in his "Series of Theological Discourses," has honestly given his testimony. He says, "This subject [endless misery] is immeasurably awful, and beyond all others affecting. Few persons can behold it in clear vision with a steady eye. The very preacher who teaches the doctrine to others, can not but know, unless certainly assured of his own salvation, (a case undoubtedly very rare) that he may at that very time be alleging arguments which are to effect *himself*, and to evince his own final destruction as well as that of others. If his heart is not made of stone, he can not contemplate the subject as it represents his fellow-men, without overwhelming amazement. At the same time the subject is unquestionably *perplexing* as well as *distressing*,"

Take another concession equally strong and earnest, from Dr. Barnes, in his Practical Sermons, pp. 123, 125. "I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why man must suffer to all eternity. I have not seen a particle of light thrown upon these subjects that has given a moment's ease to my tortured mind, nor have I an explanation to offer, or a thought to suggest, which

would be of relief to you. I trust other men as they profess to do, understand this better than I do, and that they have not the anguish of spirit which I have. But I confess, when I look on a world of sinners and of sufferers; upon death-beds and grave-yards; upon the world of woe filled with hosts to suffer forever; when I see my friends, my parents, my family, my people, my fellow-citizens—when I look upon a whole race, all involved in this sin and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God only can save them, and yet does not do it—I am struck dumb. It is all dark—dark—dark to my soul—and I can not disguise it.”

Is it possible, then, that a doctrine which fills the soul with so much anguish, and which drives the mind to the verge of despair, can claim a divine origin?—Does Benevolence claim it as her offspring, and cherish it as her beloved? No. Methinks I hear her saying with a loud and earnest voice to that doctrine, while it so insultingly lays any claim to such an origin, “Get thee hence, adversary, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.” Down, down to thy dark original, and no longer heap insult upon the name and character of God by your ungracious pretensions. For all the loveliness and purity of heaven are against thee. But Mr. Stearns says, I am for thee. He would say he was in fellowship with this *doctrine because* it had the same origin with himself,

the same parentage, namely, God, and therefore he should cherish it with sisterly affection. He believes that God pre-determined to make some of his creatures endlessly miserable ; that he brought them into existence expressly for this horrid end. He believes that, * By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death. These angels and men thus predestinated and fore-ordained, are *particularly and unchangeably designed*, and their *number is so certain and definite*, that it can not be either *increased or diminished*. For the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, God was *pleased* to pass by and to ordain some to dishonor and wrath for their sins, to the praise of his glorious justice.”—*Creed of Old South Church, Boston.*

This is the beauty of Calvinism—this the doctrine which it is said the benevolence of God sanctions, cherishes, and originated. If it be, then God so loved the world that he was really pleased to create some expressly for ultimate misery. He was so delighted with showing “the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures,” that he fore-ordained some should curse him eternally and blaspheme his name! If this be pure, unmixed benevolence in God, what would be malevolence in the devil? Supposing the devil were self-existent, that we attribute to him ubiquity, omniscience, and almightiness, and that he had unoriginated author-

ity to create :—what could he possibly do worse than that which is here ascribed to the benevolence of God ? Imagination can not conceive of any thing more cruel, more terrible, or more subversive of the great end and aim of gospel truth, namely, our reverence of God, respect for his law and love of his character. I most solemnly declare my opinion in reference to this doctrine, in the language of Llewellyn, a Welch writer. He says, “I challenge the whole body and being of moral evil itself to invent, or inspire, or whisper, any thing blacker or more wicked : yea, if sin itself had all the wit, the tongues, and pens of all men and angels to eternity, I defy the whole to say any thing of God worse than this. O sin ! thou hast spent and emptied thyself in the doctrine of John Calvin. And here I rejoice, that I have heard the utmost that malevolence itself shall ever be able to say against infinite benignity. I was myself brought up and tutored in it, and being delivered and brought to see the evil and danger, am bound by my obligations to God, angels and men, to warn my fellow-sinners. I therefore here, before God and the whole universe, recall and condemn every word I have spoken in favor of it. I thus renounce the doctrine as the rancor of devils ; a doctrine, the preaching of which is babling and mocking, its prayers blasphemies, and whose praises are the horrible yellings of sin and hell.”

Thus feelingly and earnestly did this good man lift

His warning voice against so God-dishonoring, soul-tormenting and truth-subverting a doctrine as this. Thus has he most vividly added another testimony to the fact that it produces intense torment in the mind that allows itself to give any real sanction to it. And I shall be a benefactor if, by any means, I may be able to relieve the minds of my fellow-beings from this horrible torment, which has rested with such crushing weight upon thousands. God knows the amount of wretchedness this doctrine has produced—how many scalding tears it has caused to flow—how many deep groans it has drawn from its victims of despair—how many minds it has dethroned, and how many it has sent down to an untimely grave. Can it be, I ask again, that this is the doctrine of *benevolence*? Every principle of nature, and every truth in the parental character of God answer, *no*. All the host of heaven answer *no*, and the benevolence of our own hearts echoes back an emphatic *no*.

But we will attend again more directly to his arguments, if indeed they are worthy of the name. That very benevolence of which he speaks, and upon which he builds his argument, would convert heaven itself into a state of intense suffering. It is a scripture truth that angels interested are in the conversion and happiness of human creatures—that they rejoice, or that "*joy is in heaven*," "joy in the presence of the angels of God" in consequence. This shows conclusively that the be

benevolence of heaven is satisfied only with the goodness and happiness of human creatures—that it never can be satisfied with eternal evil and unhappiness. Besides, he himself has admitted, as before quoted on page 21, that “No man can be happy in the midst of scenes and objects with which he is not pleased.” Again, on page 58 he says, “The fact is, *holy* beings do *not* delight in the punishment of the damned.” And on page 87 he inquires, “Who can harbor a *desire* that such a sentiment should be true?” I answer, no one; even if the mind were ever so well convinced “by reasons strong” that it was the doctrine of God. Hence the benevolent desires of men, “*holy* beings,” the angels of God in heaven, are all opposed to this doctrine.

Besides, the law of God itself, which is founded in eternal benevolence, requires *love* and *obedience*; and never, never is satisfied with, or ever will require eternal hatred and disobedience. Angels, then, are pleased with this law, and so shall we be, when we are made equal unto them, as the scriptures declare we shall be, “in the resurrection.” There we shall live in the full and perfect spirit of God’s law, and the benevolence we shall then cherish will forbid our turning enemies to his law by sanctioning eternal hatred and disobedience, while that law requires and is satisfied only with their opposite.

Hence, it is plain beyond all doubt, that the law of *God*, the *disposition* of angels, the angelic nature of

man in the resurrection, the character of benevolence as revealed to us by the Son of God, and the very spirit of heaven itself—all, *all* are opposed to the idea of eternal punishment, and *will be, must be*, while the long ages of heaven endure.

How then can our author make this doctrine appear benevolent? As well might he attempt to prove that light is darkness, or no more vain and futile would be the attempt to prove that men might gather grapes from thorns and figs from thistles. Look at this subject candidly, and in the clear sun-light of truth. Here is the moral law of God, which now requires, and ever will require, love and obedience, as long as there are intelligences to govern. Does the benevolence of high Heaven step in and oppose this requirement, and say, that men must and shall be endlessly unholy and unhappy? Believe it! who can? Does Mr. Stearns? If I were to put this question directly to him face to face, I would have the charity to believe that he would answer *no*—that by such answer he would show himself more in love with the true spirit of benevolence and the law of God, than with “doctrines and commandments of men.” In the spirit of candor, I defy him or any other man to reconcile the benevolence of God with the divine law, if that benevolence requires or will sanction and secure eternal unholiness and disobedience.

I am aware how he may attempt to meet these arguments. He will say we see sin and misery in this

world, and if they be consistent with divine benevolence here, it will permit them hereafter. But this presupposes no distinction between present, limited evil, and future unlimited evil. There is an obvious difference between present evil, which, as he admits, is "overruled for good," and eternal evil which produces no good whatever, but is, as he says, "a *positive evil*" itself, having no ulterior object to produce. It is consistent with benevolence that the parent should punish his disobedient child, and it is consistent only when he punishes to produce obedience and a return to duty. This fact is even admitted on page 24.

Our author may make another shift, in order to make his argument appear to have force. He may say, though the punished may not *individually* be benefitted by his sufferings, yet his sufferings may be for "the good of the moral system" at large. But who will receive this good? Whom will this suffering benefit? Certainly not God, for he is holy, and needs nothing to add to his happiness. Not the angels, for neither they nor God need the sight of misery to enhance their glory and felicity. Not the damned in hell, for it is not even pretended that they will be made better or be benefitted by it, and he even says on page 69 that they will not. Not inanimate objects, surely: who then, and what is to receive this good? Pray tell me what this good is, where it is, how it is, by whom it is enjoyed? Can any man answer? If the recipients of

this good are not in heaven, earth or hell, where are they? Are they the inhabitants of some remote wandering planet, flying through the immensity of space? If so, then they even are the fabled Salamanders, living and sporting in fire as their only natural element. For I can conceive of no other beings who could in the least be benefitted with eternal burnings.

I might here dismiss this subject, as it appears to me enough has been said to convince any candid, reflecting mind, that benevolence is utterly opposed to the doctrine of ceaseless pain. But as there are those who want line upon line, and argument upon argument, you will bear with me while I offer a few more remarks.

My opponent says, "An exercise of mind which aims to promote an inferior good, without reference to the good of the system, is not benevolence. Benevolence in God will not permit him to leave the good of the system, to promote an inferior good, the good of an individual. What is the good of an individual compared with the supreme felicity of the universe?" Does he see the force of this last remark, "*the supreme felicity of the universe?*" What is the supreme felicity of the universe? It is universal felicity, and nothing short of this. *Supreme*, means the *highest*, the *utmost*; and *universe*, means *the whole*, every part and member composing it. He has most positively and pointedly refuted himself. As the universe of intelligences is made up of parts, each individual being a component

part; the benevolence of God aiming at the highest possible good, and seeking the supreme felicity of the universe, must therefore aim at the highest possible good by seeking the supreme felicity of each individual composing it. If this argument can be refuted, an argument drawn from his own premises, then I will give up the point. *If it cannot be refuted*, then enough has been said, and all his other supposed proofs of his doctrine, fall powerless before it.

I come now to notice his argument drawn from scripture, from those passages which he says speak of the final state of the wicked, in contrast with the final state of the righteous.

He is peculiarly unfortunate: for in almost every instance he builds his argument upon assumed premises. He has done so in this instance. He has quoted a great many passages, and taken it for granted that they all relate to the future and immortal state, which he calls man's *final* state. But *not one* of them relates to that state, as I could clearly show. He quotes many passages from the Old Testament to prove man's *final* state. But is not this very singular, when it is almost universally admitted among the best biblical scholars, that the *christian* doctrine of the resurrection, or of a future immortal state, is but obscurely taught in the Old Testament, if taught at all. His argument then must be of doubtful force (if indeed it has any force at all) which he *predicates upon those passages* quoted from the Old

Testament, to show the *final* state of man. Christ brought life and immortality to light (which shows that they rested in obscurity before.) It was left for him through the gospel to bring clearly to light the doctrine of a future state. Hence there is not a single passage which he has quoted from the Old Testament, that proves any thing directly or positively in his favor, concerning the final and wretched condition of the wicked. In the New Testament the doctrine of a future state is clearly taught, but it is taught in a very few passages even there, and taught in none which my opponent has quoted. Still it may be necessary to notice some of them, which may seem to be the most unequivocal.

He says, in sec. 6, page 65, "At the end of the world, the wicked will be cast into a furnace of fire where there will be wailing and gnashing of teeth.— But the righteous shall shine forth in the kingdom of their Father. He quotes Matt. 13, where the parable of the sower is introduced. That doctrine must be of rather doubtful character which depends upon parables for its support. A certain writer observes, that a parable should not be taken as affording any certain evidence of the truth of any doctrine. We will read and examine this parable.

"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; the field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the har-

vest is the end of the world ; and the reapers are the angels. As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world : the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire : there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun, in the kingdom of their Father. So shall it be at the end of the world : the angels shall come forth and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire : there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Then he adds, "These solemn events are to take place *at the end of the world.*" Very true : but does he not know that the original word translated world signifies *age* or *dispensation* ? If he did know, why did he keep this fact from his readers ? I answer : because it would be fatal to his whole argument. The age or dispensation in the parable was the age of the Jews, the Jewish dispensation, at the close of which "these solemn events were to take place."—In both the phrases "end of the world," which occur in this parable, the word is the same in the original Greek, and has reference to the Jewish dispensation then about to close, when the *unbelieving Jews*, [signified by the "tares," and "the children of the wicked one,"] were to be separated from the *christian believers*, [signified by "the good seed, the children of the

kingdom, the righteous."]. The former were to be "cast into a furnace of fire, the latter were to be shining lights in the moral kingdom of the gospel. But what and where is this furnace spoken of? Doubtless it will be said that it is where the kingdom referred to was to be entered. That kingdom we are certified was in this world, where the field is, in which the gospel seed was sown, and declared by our Savior to be the *cosmos* which we inhabit. Hence we are not obliged to go into the future immortal state to find both the "kingdom" and the "furnace" referred to in the parable.—I know it is contended that this "*furnace*," is but another name for *hell*, a place in the under world where the wicked are tormented eternally. But where is the proof? where is there a shadow of a reason for such an opinion? Let it be shown, if it can be, for I am not by duty bound to receive any opinion that is based upon mere assumption, or that has no better support than an *ipse dixit*.

Where then, I inquire more definitely, was this "furnace?" The Lord said by the prophet Isa. 31: 9,—"*His fire is in Zion, and his furnace is in Jerusalem.*" Accordingly it was in Jerusalem where the wicked and unbelieving Jews were to be gathered, and where they were to be "devoured with burning heat, and with bitter destruction," and where there should be "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

And history informs us that all this was accomplish-

ed at the final overthrow of the Jews, the Jewish polity and the destruction of their city and temple by the Romans, when according to Josephus the Jews were gathered together in Jerusalem from the four quarters of the earth, as chaff and tares are gathered to be burned, and about one million were consumed by famine, the sword, mutual slaughter, and self-destruction.

The events, therefore, here parabolically spoken, were all fulfilled in the age and generation then existing. Hence I see no argument in this parable for the doctrine of eternal punishment.

He quotes many more passages from the New Testament, which are not parabolical, to support his view, but as they all, *without exception*, relate to man's spiritual condition here, and not his final condition hereafter, I need not make any comments upon them in this place: a few of them will receive attention hereafter. One however must receive a little attention now, because it is thought to be one of the most weighty and convincing. The passage reads thus: "Then goeth he and taketh with himself seven other spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in and dwell there; and the last state of that man is *worse* than the first." Then he adds, "There can not be a state succeeding the last.—The last state of a man is his final state." This, ironically speaking, is a sublime, glorious and all comprehensive argument for the doctrine of eternal suffering. *Because a man took and dwelt with seven spirits which*

were more wicked than himself, this was his last, final, and immortal state, and proof of his final perdition!—Really the argument is worthy only of ridicule. The *first* state of this man was when he had but *one* demon, the last state was when he had *seven* demons, and if this was his *final* state, as Mr. Stearns contends, then he could have no *more* than seven demons to all eternity. For according to the rule of proportion, if the addition of *seven* demons altered his state and gave him one succeeding the first when he had but *one* demon, then any additional number to the seven would make that state not a "*final*" one. Really, I was not aware before that Partialism limited a man to the possession of *seven demons only*, in his final immortal state.

But as there are inquiring minds which seek to know what this passage does mean, I will offer a few explanatory remarks. You will remember that this is a parable, not a statement of a literal transaction, as many understand.

The original design of this parable was to illustrate the condition of the Jews. The "unclean spirit was a personification of the wickedness and obstinancy of the Jews. It left them for a season we are told. And Jesus says of the Jews, "John was a burning and shining light, and ye were willing for a *season* to rejoice in that light." But the unclean spirit that had been in them returned, found the house swept, and garnished, that is, fitted and ready for some occupant, and re-en-

tered with greater power, that is, the Jews increased their obstinancy and unbelief, continued to fill up the measure of their iniquity, and consequently their last state when they fondly looked for a special deliverer, was worse than any former one they had experienced, because they bro't upon themselves greater tribulation than was ever before seen on earth. Their "last state," therefore, was when they had "filled up the measure of their iniquity" and their kingdom was taken from them and they ceased to be a nation. Jesus himself made an application of the things contained in this parable, in these words, "*Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation.*" The things, therefore, spoken of, had their fulfillment in that generation, and had no reference at all to the events of a future life. Here I end my remarks upon this text.

After saying, "The last state of a man is his final state," my opponent adds: "Therefore after the judgment it will be said of all men, Rev. 22:11, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still; and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still; and he that is holy, let him be holy still." This he assumes without one particle of proof relates to man's future final state, where the characters of all men are unalterable and the doom of the wicked is irrevocably fixed and sealed up forever. Consequently, since there is no change after death according to *his view*, he should add; let him who was a drunkard

here, be still a drunkard there; the murderer, a murderer still; the hangman, a hangman still; the robber, a robber still; the blasphemer, a blasphemer still; the free agent who had abused his agency here, remain a free agent still. All this must be true if the text relate to man's future *final* state, and there be no *post mortem* change. Besides, this view represents God as *changing*, and virtually saying to the wicked, I was once opposed to your wickedness and sought to make you obedient and happy, but since you obstinately persist in your wicked career, and slight all my invitations, being-determined to rebel against me, I am now determined you shall: so rebel on, curse on, take thy fill of sin, for this is my fixed and unalterable purpose now. I will side with the devil and bring him into my service now, as a faithful agent who shall torment you world without end. He has sought long and diligently for this employment, and I will now give it to him without reserve.

To what wretched extremes will not the attempt to sustain an erroneous doctrine lead men. The doctrine of endless sinning and suffering would dethrone God—make him a changeable, hateful, and cruel being—rob heaven of all its loveliness, and banish benevolence from the universe.

But I would not leave you in the dark concerning this passage. A few explanatory remarks must suffice. The verse preceding the passage reads thus: "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for the time

is at hand." This shows that the things following were to be fulfilled shortly, and not in the eternal world.—The words following the passage read, "Behold, I come quickly, and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Hence it is evident that no reference whatever was made to futurity by the passage quoted by my opponent. The passage is of a similar import with the one we find in Matt. 13:28—30. The servant said unto his Lord concerning the tares, "Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? But he said, nay: lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. Let both grow together until the harvest." That is, be not impatient to effect this separation. Let the tares and the wheat, that is, the just and the unjust, the holy and the unholy remain as they are till God's time, "till the harvest," that is, the conclusion of the Jewish age, when God by his signal judgment would make an unexpected change in the condition of both classes, and manifestly show who were his true servants and who were his enemies.

After closing his numerous and irrelevant quotations and his remarks upon them, he then adds: "Can any man who does not trifle with the veracity of Jehovah, indulge the belief that all men will be saved?" I answer, yes. It is "the veracity of Jehovah which enables me to believe that all men will be saved from sin; and why should I trifle with it? God forbid that I should trifle with that which above all other things gives

meth the greatest peace and enjoyment of soul. Since God hath spoken of the times of the restitution of all things by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began, (Acts 3:21,) shall I not believe him? Since he has promised that in his Son "all the nations and families of the earth shall be blessed," shall I trifle with his word? The scriptures inform me that "He is faithful who promised;" that having promised, "he is able also to fulfill;" and shall I distrust him? No, never. I believe also in his *threatnings*, as well as his promises, though this author does us the injustice of accusing us of "overlooking those scriptures which set forth the character of God as being terrible to evil doers." We believe he will reward the virtuous, and punish the vicious—visit "tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil." The burden of our message upon this subject is, "Say ye to the righteous, that it shall be well with them: for they shall eat the fruit of their doings. Woe unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him, for the reward of his hands shall be given him." Isa. 3:10, 11.

Besides, he has treated us unkindly by asserting that "Universalism is the same doctrine which was preached to our mother Eve. It ruined the world. "Thou shalt not surely die," said the arch deceiver. This was a lie: and the lapse of six thousand years has produced no change in its nature. It is still a lie, and those who believe it, believe a lie." We deny the charge

Ours is not the doctrine of the arch deceiver. Jonathan Edwards, a strict Calvinist like this author, and late President of Princeton College, in a book entitled, "The justice of God in the damnation of sinners," says on page 94, that "*The devil is orthodox in his faith*—he is no Deist, Socinian, or Arian. He believes the true *scheme of doctrine*—the *articles of his faith* are all *sacred*."

Whether Mr. Stearns admits this or not, one truth is clear, that with his present theology or orthodoxy had he been present at the time of Eve's temptation, he would have said to her as he has on many pages of his book, that though you partake of the forbidden fruit, Christ as a substitute has been appointed to bear all your punishment and satisfy divine justice for you, hence you may escape the threatened death ; hence also it is "*not certain*" and positive that ye shall die.

Now I will leave you to judge whether this so called "*orthodox*" and popular doctrine, or whether the doctrine which asserts that punishment is certain and there is no escape, is the doctrine which "*the arch deceiver* preached to our mother Eve."

In my next I shall invite your attention to the sin against the Holy Ghost.

LECTURE IX.

Agreeable with the notice given in my last lecture, the sin against the Holy Ghost will be the subject of my present remarks. The passage of scripture in which mention is made of this sin, is in Matt. 12 : 31, 32. Also Mark 1 : 28, 29. "Wherefore I say unto you, all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."

Mr. Stearns quotes this text as affording conclusive proof of the doctrine of eternal punishment. He says "The reason why God will not forgive blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, is not because there is any want of sufficiency in the atonement of Christ, but because of the magnitude of the crime." This then is the reason, "the *magnitude* of the crime." It "is not because there is any want of sufficiency in the atonement of Christ, which according to his view is *infinite*, and of greater magnitude than the crimes of all men put together—it is not on account of any lack of power, for God is almighty, but because of the *magnitude* of the crime he will not forgive it. This is the only reason. Hence the farther his children

wander from him, the less he cares about them. The greater their sickness the less affection he has for them and the less he will do for them. And though the blasphemer himself might come before him with "strong crying and tears" and a penitent heart, pleading and entreating for forgiveness, yet he sternly answers, *no, I will not forgive you, your crime is of such a magnitude!* Is this the character of our heavenly Father whom we are required to love and adore? Is this his disposition towards his children, as set forth by Jesus his Son? He said unto his disciples, "If thy brother trespass against thee, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him." Luke 17 : 3, 4. "Then came Peter to him, and said, Lord, how oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? till seven times? Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, until seven times, but until seventy times seven." Matt. 18 : 21, 22. Is the sin of blasphemy seventy times seven greater than all other sins, so that it *can not* be forgiven by God or man? It is assumed that there is a certain magnitude in sin beyond which forgiveness can not be extended. But Christ's answer to Peter is a refutation of this idea.

Again: Christ directs us how to pray. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." If men use detraction and evil speaking against us, are we not bound as christians to forgive them? And does God require that of us which he will

not do himself? The apostle exhorts us to "be imitators of God as dear children." If then, the sin of detraction God will not forgive, we should imitate him, and not exercise forgiveness toward those who indulge in the same sin against us. But can we do so as christians and feel justified in our conscience? No. I can not therefore advocate a doctrine which my conscience condemns, which I cannot reduce to practice, and which is opposed to every principle of christian duty.

But it will be said, the language is positive and unequivocal: "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it *shall not* be forgiven him." But in our zeal to support some sectarian view we should never allow ourselves to give such an interpretation to any passage of scripture as would be blasphemy itself, or such as would if carried out to its final results detract from the goodness and benevolence of God. To charge God with *unforgiveness*, is to attribute to him a nature and a disposition like "the arch deceiver," and accordingly to do virtually what the Jews did when they blasphemed the Son of God, by saying, he performed his miraculous works by the agency of the devil. An unforgiving disposition is the devil's chief agent. And to charge God with employing the same agent in his moral government of the world, is positively blasphemy in the scripture sense of that term. Besides, to teach that God will torture his creatures eternally without designing to do them any good—will mock their groans and

immortal agonies, and compel them to do just what the devil has long sought to have them do, namely, to rebel against all law and all goodness—to curse God and all holy beings and sink deeper and deeper in depravity and the ocean of immortal woe,—to teach this doctrine, I say, is blasphemy—it is the *greatest* blasphemy—that of the Jews does not compare with it in “magnitude;” nothing can exceed it—the devil himself could not say any thing worse of Deity than this—the utmost that malignity itself could invent, could not make the character of any being appear more abhorrent. The Jews’ blasphemy, referred to, sinks into comparative littleness before it. For that consisted in making the operation of God’s Spirit to be the work of the devil, and that to be in reference to *one* act and *one individual only*. But this doctrine ascribes to God acts approved by the devil, which are to be continued to *all eternity*, and performed on *countless myriads* of his own offspring, who are not (like the person in the text) “blind and dumb.”

O how chilling is the thought that men of this age, living under the full meridian of God’s word, should ascribe to the eternal Father such a character as the doctrine of eternal punishment imputes to him! How it robs God of all his loveliness and glory! How it arrays the scriptures against all reason and consistency! We cease to wonder that infidelity rages—that scoffers at the scriptures are multiplied, when that book is rep-

presented as inculcating such unworthy views of God.

Let us then see if the passage under consideration can not be interpreted so as not to conflict with the benevolent character of God and the general teachings of his holy word. If we can, we shall have proved that the passage affords no evidence in support of the doctrine of eternal punishment. You will bear in mind the fact, that the passage positively asserts that "*all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men,*" except this one against the Holy Spirit. If this one can be shown not to be *absolutely* unpardonable, then the passage affords proof of the doctrine of universal holiness, rather than of eternal misery. Do not be startled if I make this attempt.

1st. Then, I shall inquire what blasphemy is, who committed it, and what this blasphemy of the Holy Spirit consisted in. Blasphemy in general is detraction, slander, evil speaking with a design to injure. The Jews were guilty of this sin in an eminent degree in their opposition to our Savior. And the blasphemy of the Holy Spirit, referred to, consisted in their maliciously ascribing to the prince of devils the power by which Jesus wrought the miracle before them, of restoring one who was brought to him "blind and dumb." This blasphemy was unlike every other. The Jews saw an open miracle performed, and instead of attributing it to the operation of God's spirit, they charged Christ with being in league with the chief of demons.

Hence this sin was accounted more heinous, more deep-seated and obstinate, than any other, and for *this* reason it was said it "*shall not be forgiven*" meaning that it shall continue to be committed. This will lead me,

2d. To the inquiry, what is meant here by forgiveness? and what is meant by the phrase "neither in this world, nor the world to come?"

Christ well knew with what tenacity the Jews held to the doctrine of demoniacal possession—how prone they were to attribute to the agency of demons any thing like a miracle, or any act above their comprehension, like that of restoring sight to the blind and speech to the dumb—and knowing all this, together with their deep-rooted obstinacy and perversity of heart, he could declare positively and truthfully that they would still continue to commit this sin of blasphemy. And this was all that was meant by the expression, "shall not be forgiven." As though he had said, such is the Jews' attachment to the doctrine of demoniacal possession, and such is its powerful influence upon their benighted and superstitious minds, that they will obstinately persist in ascribing that power to demons by which he and his apostles wrought miracles. But how long would they persist? During the whole period in which miracles were performed, signified by the phrases "*this world*," and "*world to come*," meaning the Jewish age then existing and about to close, and the *christian or apostolic* age which was immediately to

succeed it, and during which miracles would be performed. Throughout these two periods, while they had an opportunity of witnessing the operation of God's spirit in restoring sight to the blind, &c., they would and *did* continue to revile these extraordinary spiritual gifts bestowed upon Christ and his apostles, by which they performed many wonderful deeds. And hence this sin of blasphemy was not remitted, sent out, or expelled; which is the sense of "to forgive." This view is sustained by Stephen, Acts 7: 51, "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost: as your fathers did, so do ye." This same Stephen, we are told, in a few verses preceding, "*Did great wonders and miracles among the people.*" And it was in view of these, that he accused them of resisting the Holy Ghost; that is, of rejecting those spiritual gifts conferred on the apostles, as the agency of demons. This was some years after Christ by the same gift had performed the miracle of healing, referred to in the passage under consideration. Christ said, "*Ye will not come to me that ye may have life.*" This is simply affirming a fact in relation to them, which *then* was and would *continue to exist*. The passage under consideration affirms *precisely the same thing*, as before illustrated, namely, *the Jews' continued obstinacy and perverseness.*

But how long were they to continue in that state? Mr. Stearns would answer, eternally, unchangeably.

because it is said, "shall not be forgiven," "hath ~~never~~ forgiveness," and "is in danger of *eternal* damnation." And it is inquired, how can they "be in danger of that which does not exist?" We do not deny the fact expressed in the phrase "eternal damnation." There was such a judgment denounced against the Jews. The word "*eternal*," here, is from the Greek word *aion*, the substantive form of *aionian*, and is in many places translated *age*—(see Heb. 6: 5, Eph. 2: 7)—therefore the simple meaning of the phrase "eternal judgment," is *age judgment*, or the judgment of that age, referring to a particular judgment that should fall upon the Jewish nation for their unbelief and rejection of the Messiah. They were in danger of this judgment, liable, and exposed to it continually; for it should come in a day when they looked not for it—in an unexpected time.

Hence we cannot understand in an absolute sense, the phrase, "hath never forgiveness," without doing violence to reason and the general doctrine of the scriptures. Christ even prayed for the forgiveness of these same people who had blasphemed. Could he have done so consistently, if he had affirmed *absolutely* that they *could not* be forgiven? The learned Bishop Pearce said, "With God there is no sin that is unpardonable. And the truth of this observation will appear from the following instances:—Jesus said, in Matt. 10: 33, '*Whoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father*,' where the threatening is as

strong as this in the case of *blasphemy against the Holy Ghost*; and yet, when Peter shortly afterwards denied Jesus before men three times, joining oaths and curses with his denials, yet, upon his repenting and *weeping bitterly*, he was not only forgiven, but continued in his apostleship. Again, when Jesus was on the cross, some of the rulers *derided him, saying, he saved others, let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God.* Luke 23: 35. By which words, it appears that they acknowledged Jesus to have wrought miracles, and yet rejected him, denying that he wrought them by the *holy spirit of God*: and yet Jesus prayed to His Father that they might be forgiven. Luke 23: 34."

"Christ said to his own followers on a certain occasion, "*Wither I go ye cannot come,*" and assured them that the same declaration had been made to the Jews, the very people who had blasphemed. What was true of them, therefore, was true of the Jews, and so vice versa. This language is stronger and more unequivocal if possible than that in the text under discussion, where it is "*shall not,*" but in the other case "*can not.*" Christ immediately explains himself by saying, "*Thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterwards.*" John 13: 36. The same language for a similar reason might be applied to the Jews. They would not believe on him and receive him *then*, but they would "*afterward,*" at some subsequent period, namely, "*the ages to come,*" when greater displays of

God's favor in his kindness to us would be shown, when greater light should be shed upon the understanding; Eph. 2: 7; for Christ predicted a time when they should say, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Matt. 23: 39.

We have direct and positive proof to show that many of these very blaspheming Jews were forgiven in the period signified by the phrase "world to come," namely, the apostolic age. We have reason to believe that many millions of Jews, nay, the majority of the nation, committed that sin: and can we in truth declare that not one ever has been or ever shall be forgiven? No. On the day of Pentecost, when there were congregated in Jerusalem, Jews, and men out of every nation under heaven, there were three thousand souls converted. And is there the slightest evidence to believe that there was not one Jew among the whole who had been a blasphemer? Peter, addressing the congregation, said, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words." Then Peter goes on to discourse to them concerning the Christ. And after he had closed his discourse, it is said, "when they heard this, they were pricked in their hearts, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, men and brethren, what shall we do?" [Remember; these were Jews.] Then Peter replied, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, [sins of blasphemy included] and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

[They should now be so far enlightened and reformed that they should receive and cherish that very spirit which they had blasphemed.] "Then they that gladly received the word were baptized, [for the remission or forgiveness of their sins of course,] and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." Were there no Jews here? If there were any, some among that number had blasphemed, but were now forgiven and received the Holy Ghost themselves. In all this I discover nothing inconsistent with the intended signification of the text under examination. And the circumstances here show that the phrase, "shall not be forgiven," was not intended to be taken in an absolute sense, for some *were forgiven*. And besides, if it were intended to be so understood, then no one committing blasphemy can be forgiven *even on repentance*. But this idea contradicts John, who says, [1 John 1: 9,] "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Hence we have seen that Peter and John, both oppose the common view; which fact is a sufficient reason for our rejecting it. For they, being eye-witnesses of their Master's works, and personal attendants on his ministry, could not be supposed to err in relation to the meaning of this passage. It appears they agreed in their views, as I have shown, and did not understand the passage in an absolute sense.

The prophets all along with one voice, and the evan-

gellists and apostles after them, all represent the Jews as being included in the covenant of God's salvation, and subjects of his mercy and forgiveness.—The spirit of God speaking through the prophet Isaiah, 1: 18, said of the Jews, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." By this it appears the design of the prophet was to show, that however deep the stain of sin, it might and should be washed away. John says, 1st epistle, "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin," [not excepting the sin against the Holy Ghost.] Again: "He was manifested to take away our sins." 1 John 3: 5. Again: "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world." John 1: 29. This is broad and comprehensive language, and must include the sin of the Jews as well as that of the Gentiles.—Said Peter, addressing the Jews, Acts 3: 26, "Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." This was the blessing to be conferred, *the turning away of every one from his iniquities*. Does this look as though some among them never could or should be turned away from their sins, or should never have their iniquities forgiven? Paul agreeing with Peter, says, Rom. 11: 25—27, "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be

saved : as it is written, there shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and *shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob*; for this is my covenant unto them, when I shall **TAKE AWAY THEIR SINS.**" Here we are certified, that though Israel was then blind, and would remain blind, until *the fulness of the Gentiles be come in,*" yet "*all Israel shall be saved.*" For "God hath included them all in unbelief that he *might have mercy upon all.*"

Does the eternal non-forgiveness of the unbelieving Jews, look like having mercy upon all ? Is there mercy in an unforgiving disposition, or in keeping the Jews in a state of absolute irremissible blasphemy here, and then after death thrust them down to interminable wretchedness that they might blaspheme his name more and more to all eternity ? I desire to know, is there mercy in all this ?

But I shall pursue my remarks no further upon this passage, for I have *conclusively* shown not only what it does mean, but also that not the slightest shadow of an argument can be fairly deduced from it in favor of eternal punishment, though my opponent has seized upon it as one of the strongest proofs in the whole bible. I have not only aimed to show what it does *not* mean, but more *particularly* to show what it *does* mean, that you might be the more enlightened upon a subject of such deep inquiry for having listened to me. This is my apology for having detained you so long upon this point.

Your attention is now called to the case of Judas Iscariot who betrayed Christ. Mr. Stearns endeavors to draw an argument from the manner of Judas' death, that since he committed suicide, he must be a subject of eternal punishment. There is no mercy for him—his doom is inevitable. He seems to be absolutely certain that Judas is now roasting in hell. But it is a fact worthy of remark, that not a single word or hint is given of Judas' being in hell, or suffering at all in a future state. Out of the eight times the name occurs in the New Testament, no mention is made at all of his future suffering; nor does any of the New Testament writers in all that they have said upon the subject of rewards and punishments ever refer to Judas' case for proof of endless suffering—which fact is unaccountably strange if his future endless punishment is so certain and positive, as my antagonist would have us believe. Both Matthew and Luke trace the history and conduct of this man along very minutely till his death, and there leave him. Matthew uses the expression, "went and hanged himself." Luke says, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." Dr. Adam Clarke says, "When we consider that the word—which we translate *hanged himself*, is by the very best critics thus rendered, *choked*; and that the words of the sacred historian at this place, *falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out*, may be no

than a *delicate* mode of expressing the circumstance.” And then he quotes in illustration several cases of a similar death. The case of Jeheram is referred to, 2 Chron. 21:18, 19, where we read, “And after all this the Lord smote him in his bowels with an incurable disease: and it came to pass that, after the end of two years, *his bowels fell out*, by reason of his sickness: so he died of sore diseases.” “The death of *Herod* was probably of the same kind, Acts 12: 22. That of Aristobulus, described by Josephus, War, book i. chapter 3, is of a similar nature: having murdered his mother and brother, his mind was greatly terrified, and his bowels being *torn with excruciating torments*, he voided *much blood*, and died in miserable agonies.” Again, he thus describes the horrible death of Zenodorus: “His *bowels bursting*, and his strength exhausted by the *loss of much blood*, he died at Antioch in Syria. In addition to all these cases I might refer you to that of Julian, the apostate, who died a similar death, and to that of Felix also, one of his accomplices. These are enough to show the high *probability* that the death of Judas was of a similar kind—that instead of committing suicide, his death was occasioned by excessive grief. I see therefore no possible evidence in the manner of Judas’ death in favor of his future endless suffering.

But it will be added, the scripture says he went “to his *own place*.” But what place was that, that was particularly *his own*? Was it hell? and was there no

other place which could strictly be called his own? So Mr. Stearns seems to think, and he is quite sure that Judas went there. Now if it could be clearly proved that there could not possibly be any *other place* in all the vast universe of God which could be strictly called *his own*, then and not till then would his argument be irresistible and entitled to respect. Judas' "*own place*," was that from which he had *already fallen*, and not one to which he was yet to fall. "His own place," therefore, was the "*apostleship* from which he by transgression fell." And Mathias was appointed to fill this place, so that it was *Mathias* that went to the place referred to, rather than Judas. Hence, not a *solitary word*, not *even a hint* is given concerning the *place* to which Judas went or the condition in which he was, after death.

But much capital is attempted to be made out of the expression, "It had been good for that man, if he had not been born." It is said, "On the supposition that Judas is saved, this declaration of the Savior can not be true." Well, supposing he is not saved : would not the fact charge God with an absolute and eternal evil ? If the doctrine of endless misery must be sustained by such a charge as this, I can have no fellowship with it whatever, and no argument can prove it true. So, in attempting to avoid Scylla, Mr. Stearns steers away his vessel directly into Charybdis, or, in his endeavor to avoid being wrecked on what he fancies a fatal rock, *he pushes off* and plunges into an equally fatal whi

pool. Here is no attempt of his at reconciling the passage with reason and creative goodness—no effort to give such an interpretation as would silence the scoffs of infidels, and exculpate the divine character from all appearance of evil. To sustain his theory he interprets the language literally, and maintains that God brought Judas into existence knowing that he would be an eternal loser by that existence, or gave him being when he knew that non-existence would have been better. Does not this view charge God with intentional wrong? and yet it is the view dragged in to support his argument of endless misery. Jesus did not intend that his language should be understood literally, but as a proverbial expression, common among the Jews, and signifying that Judas had committed a great and aggravated crime, *compared* with which his good acts might have appeared small. Similar expressions occur in Eccl. 4: 3; 6: 3; Job 3: 16. It is understood by the best biblical scholars and critics, as a proverbial expression. *Livermore* says, "It is plainly a proverbial expression, descriptive of a great calamity or punishment. Many phrases of the same purport are found in the Jewish writings. This is one: "He that knoweth the law and doeth it not, it were better for him that he had not come into the world." The inferences which have sometimes been drawn from a strictly literal interpretation of these words, in regard to the nature and duration of future punishment, have therefore little

pertinence or warrant." And I will here add the testimony of Dr. Adam Clarke. He says, "I contend that there is no positive evidence of the final damnation of Judas in the sacred text." I agree with him: and being perfectly satisfied that the doctrine cannot be maintained by any fair interpretation of the text, I close my remarks upon this subject.

LECTURE X.

I will call your attention, in the introduction of my lecture this evening, to the supposed arguments of my opponent drawn from the resurrection of the dead, that all men will not be saved. He says, "I shall attempt to show that the glorious doctrine of the resurrection, affords conclusive proof that all men will not be saved."

How he can call that a *glorious* doctrine of the resurrection, which teaches that a portion of God's offspring shall be brought forth from their quiet slumbers in their graves, to wail on in endless, hopeless pain, while heaven itself shall last—I can not tell. I can see nothing *glorious* in a doctrine which presents such a view as this. I beg therefore, that for the honor of Christianity and its Founder, he would withdraw the expression, and say rather, (ironically) the glorious doctrine of John Calvin. For the glorious doctrine of the resurrection, such as Christ and his apostles taught, holds

up no such horrifying picture to tarnish its own glory. There is, I humbly conceive, a vast difference between the doctrine of the resurrection which they taught, and the doctrine which has been ascribed to them. The doctrine ascribed to them might be expressed clearly enough by Albert Barnes, a Calvinist, in those words. He says, "Those who have done evil shall be raised up to be *condemned*, or *damm'd*. This shall be *the* object of raising them up—this *the sole* design." If this be the christian doctrine of the resurrection—if the *only* object and "*the sole design*" of raising up the wicked be to pour out upon them endless damnation, and God had created them *expressly* and *only* for this horrid end, then truly enough the christian doctrine of the resurrection affords proof that all men will not be saved. But I protest against this being called the *christian doctrine*, and particularly do I object to its being called a *glorious doctrine*. In view of this inglorious sentiment, the feeling heart might be supposed to exclaim in the truly strong [and descriptive language of Dr. Young :

"Father of Mercies ! why from silent earth
Didst thou awake and *curse* me into birth ?
Tear me from quiet, ravish me from night ?
And make a thankless present of thy light ?
Push into being a reverse of thee,
And animate a clod with misery ?"

And yet a doctrine which ascribes all this to the eternal Father is presumptuously termed a "*glorious doctrine* !" It would have us believe that "without any

act of the creature moving him," God from all eternity decreed, and brought some into existence expressly for ultimate misery, and will raise them from the only to make them immortally wretched.

"And this, *my Help, my God*, at thy decree?
Nature is chang'd, and hell should succor me.
And canst thou then look down from perfect bliss,
And see me plunging in the dark abyss?
Calling thee Father, in a sea of fire?
Or pouring blasphemies at Thy desire?
With mortals' anguish wilt Thou raise thy name?
And by my pangs omnipotence proclaim?"

"Why burst the barriers of my peaceful grave?
Ah! cruel death! that would no longer save,
But grudg'd me e'en that narrow dark abode,
And cast me out into the wrath of God;
Where shrieks, the roaring flame, the rattling chain,
And all the dreadful eloquence of pain,
Our only song; black fire's malignant light,
The sole refreshment of the blasted sight.
Must all those powers heaven gave me to supply
My soul with pleasure, and bring in my joy,
Rise up in arms against me, join the foe,
Sense, reason, memory, increase my woe?
And shall my voice, ordained on hymns to dwell,
Corrupt to groans, and blow the fires of hell?
Oh! must I look with terror on my gain,
And with *existence* only measure *pain*?
What! no reprieve, no least indulgence giv'n,
No beam of hope from any point of heaven!
Ah! Mercy! Mercy! art thou dead above?
Is love extinguished in the Source of love?"

Yes, we reply, if this doctrine be true, *Mercy from above is DEAD—love is there extinguished forever*; and to say that the doctrine is built on the *love or benevolence of God*, is the highest insult to the Majesty of Heaven. It is therefore this *inglorious doctrine of men's future state*, and not the *bible doctrine of the resurrection* which can possibly claim any affinity with the sentiment my opponent advances.

We will now attend to some of the proofs which he attempts to draw from scripture of the doctrine he advances in opposition to Universalism. The first passage which he quotes is in Acts 25: 15. "And have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust." But instead of this text being proof of the endless misery of any man, or proof against the salvation of all, it is to me quite conclusive proof that all men will be saved. For "hope," being composed of exultation and desire, shows conclusively that the apostle saw nothing in the resurrection of the two classes named, that was *undesirable*. Could this be true if he looked forward and saw that some of those who would be raised, would be raised only to be plunged into rivers of immortal woe?—Could he, viewing such a scene, say that he sincerely desired it? No, impossible. Hence the *hope* the apostle cherished is conclusive evidence against his belief in eternal punishment, and in favor of the ultimate

holiness and happiness of all men. But supposing the phrase "just and unjust," referred to being in another world—is there any thing said about the eternal damnation of the unjust? Is there any thing said about their misery at all? Not a word. His argument therefore for eternal punishment drawn from this text is altogether fanciful, and rests on assumed premises. But we are by no means obliged to interpret the phrase "just and unjust" as meaning those who shall be just and unjust in a future state. Paul used the terms in the sense in which his accusers, the Pharisees, used them, as signifying more particularly those who were of the circumcision, the Jews, and those who were not, the Gentiles. Now Paul says his accusers allowed that he had a hope toward God of the resurrection of both these classes.—But his view of the *nature* of the resurrection differed widely from their's: They believed in the Pythagorean resurrection, or the transmigration of the souls of the wicked into the bodies of other men. Herein then, the apostle and his accusers differed. The apostle carried not this distinction between the just and the unjust into a future state, but they did. And hence we read in verse 21 of this chapter, that the apostle was called in question for his view concerning the resurrection of the dead. And we read also in Acts 26 : 6, that he was arraigned before king Agrippa and judged for the hope he entertained of the promise made of God unto *the fathers*. Now that promise was a promise of bless-

ings to all nations, and on this universal promise he founded his universal hope, for which he was judged and condemned by the narrow minded Partialists of his age. Paul, in contradistinction to the people of his own nation, cherished a bright and pleasing hope of the final sanctification of both Jews and Gentiles, and that as in Adam all have died, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

Now considering the nature of Paul's hope, could he have hoped for the resurrection of any to a state of unending and indescribable torment? Could he have hoped for an event which should usher a part of his own brethren of the human family into such a state as this? No, never. Paul was too benevolent a man, too much refined by christian love, since he had ceased to "breathe out threatening and slaughter." He could weep and lament bitterly over the unhappy *temporal* condition of his brethren the Jews—but when he uttered the text under consideration, had he become so changed in his feelings, so hardened and callous to every feeling of benevolence, as to *hope* for their resurrection to immortal agonies? *It can not be.* We would do the apostle the greatest injustice to charge him with such views and feelings. Therefore it must be plain, that this text affords no proof that all men will not be saved, but on the contrary proves that all men shall experience a resurrection to a happy immortality; for *this*, and *this* only, is a subject of hope.

We will now notice his quotation from Daniel 12:2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." But does this passage refer to the christian doctrine of the resurrection of all men to an immortal state? My opponent has taken it for granted that it does, and hence his argument is based on mere assumption and is of no force. He conveys the idea that this passage fixes the immortal condition of *all men*. But mark the language. "*Many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." It is not here said *all* men shall awake.—Hence it is not the christian doctrine of the resurrection of all men which is here referred to. We honestly believe he has grossly misunderstood the original meaning and reference of this text. We will read its connexion, which is as follows. "And *at that time* shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people; and there shall be *a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and AT THAT TIME* thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Then follows the question when these things should be, and the answer, namely, "*when* he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, *all these things*

shall be finished." Here we are told explicitly when this *awaking* should take place. It was when the power of God's ancient people the Jews, was scattered; or in other words, when they fell a prey to the Romans—were trodden under foot by them and dispersed among all nations. All this happened soon after Christ's ascension, who *himself* has made *this application*. For in Matt. 24 : 15, Mark 13 : 14, and Luke 21 : 22, he quotes from Daniel, and shows that the "time of trouble" referred to, was within that generation, and when Jerusalem was sacked and destroyed. It was a circumstance connected with which there should be a great awakening of the morally dead—the deliverance of those who were found written in the book, or of those whose names were enrolled among the faithful; and the righteous should shine, or go forth displaying more luminously the truths of God in the newly established kingdom of their divine Master.

Again : in immediate connexion with the passage we have just been considering, he quotes the passage in John 5 : 28, 29, as collateral, and as meaning the same with that in Daniel. "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." This was also a moral resurrection referred to, and so clearly set forth by our Savior that it would

seem almost impossible for any man to misunderstand him. In the 24th verse he had said, "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life." Here the passing from death unto life, is the resurrection referred to. And the phrase "shall not *come* into condemnation," is the same as to say, shall not experience resurrection to condemnation. Our Savior immediately adds, as if to make this subject plain to the understanding of all, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live." The time had then already arrived when the work should be commenced. The dead referred to—then dead, that is, morally; and those who were to come forth to life were then in possession of no life, and accordingly the voice which the dead shall hear, was then spoken and heard. The Rev. George Cappe has a very excellent and consistent phrase on this text, which I would here beg leave to present as fully and clearly expressing my sentiments: "The time is at no great distance, within the compass of this generation, when all that are now in the grave—who at present sit in darkness and the shadow of death—the whole body of the Jewish people—shall hear the voice of God summoning them to judgment; and then, at length all awakened to perceive who and

he is, shall come forth out of their present state of darkness and ignorance, to a new state of mind—to a resurrection, which, to those who have been obedient to the calls of Providence, shall issue in the preservation of their lives, amidst the calamities which shall overwhelm their country—to those who have refused to hearken—to them; shall issue in their condemnation, to fall among them that fall, and to take their share in all the bitterness of the calamities that are hastening to involve this country,”

But notwithstanding this plain common-sense view of the subject, the word “*graves*” will be urged upon our special notice as having a weight and meaning against this view. It is said the dead were in the *graves*, and we must understand this literally. Why? is there any absolute necessity for our adopting this view? No. Why then not adopt the same mode of interpreting these words that we do those in Ezekiel 37, 12? There the same class of people are represented as being in their graves, and coming up out of their graves. And yet all this is figurative. Why then may not the Savior apply the same language to the Jews in his day?—Surely there were many who experienced a resurrection, who came forth from their graves of moral corruption—from the lowest depths of darkness and pollution, in the time of Christ and his apostles, when “the voice of the Son of God” was heard and it aroused the nations of the earth—when the trump of the gospel

was sounded in all the kingdoms of the world, and many entered into life. Hence we read, "You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins. And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Eph. 2 : 1, 5, 6. "We know that we have passed *from death unto life*, because we love the brethren. 1; John 3 : 14.

Hence, from these quotations and the remarks now offered, it appears that a resurrection such as Christ spoke of, was experienced in the days of Christ and his apostles.

The next passage which my opponent quotes is in Gal. 6 : 8, "He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the spirit, shall of the spirit reap life everlasting." Then follows his interpretation. "The present life is the seed time; the life to come is the harvest. Then shall men reap according to what they have sown." I am by no means bound to receive this interpretation. The most simple view of the text is, he who soweth carnal things shall reap carnal things; and he who soweth spiritual things, shall reap spiritual things.

But nothing is said about reaping in "the life to come," as he has unwarrantably asserted. It does not require all the long ages of Time's duration and a part of eternity for the seeds of sin or the seeds of righteousness to bring forth their fruit, as the sinful and the righteous each can testify if they will; and besides their

own experience teaches them that the seed has brought forth in the same season and soil in which it was sown: I had therefore much rather depend on the *experience* of men, in proof of any doctrine, than the assertion of any man when no actual experience can be brought forward to prove the assertion true.

Again, he says, "The *order* in which the dead shall rise, very forcibly proves the doctrine of eternal punishment." His vision must be very strangely perverted to perceive that "the *order* in which men rise contains a very *forcible* proof of the doctrine. He quotes 1 Cor. 15: 22, 23. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. But every man in his own *order*; Christ the first fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." By the phrase, "every man in his own *order*," it is evident that nothing more than an *order of time* is referred to. It is therefore strange to me that he should see any proof of eternal punishment in this *order of time*. The apostle proceeds to show what this order is. "Christ the *first* fruits; *afterwards* they that are Christ's at his coming." But he will say the phrase, "They that are Christ's at his coming," implies that there will be some at Christ's coming who will not be his. But this is an unwarrantable inference, and positively refuted by the preceding and succeeding context. The preceding reads, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive"—the same number, the "*even so*"

number, that die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, not out of him. Let him then *prove* that men will be in the resurrection made alive *out* of Christ, otherwise his *very forcible proof* from the order in which men will *rise*, will be no proof at all. Here we are certified that as many as die in Adam shall be made alive in Christ, and "he that is in *Christ* is a new creature." After saying, "Christ the *first* fruits; afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming," the apostle immediately adds, "*Then* cometh the end, (the end of Christ's mediatorial reign) when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

Again, we are referred to a passage in Rev. 20 : where the apostle speaks of the first resurrection, and of the second death. . But as this language has no reference to the literal resurrection or literal death, but to an apostacy and a return therefrom ages ago, it is entirely foreign from his purpose, and proves nothing in his favor. He also points us to certain passages in 2d Pet. 3: 6, 7, 10, 12, where the heavens are spoken of as being on fire, being dissolved, and the elements melting with fervent heat. But as all this language is figurative, and designed to represent the passing away dissolving of the political and religious state of the *Jews*, and so understood by the best and most approved commentators, I consider that no argument can

drawn from it in favor of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and shall therefore pass it without further comment.

He quotes 2d Thess. 1: 7, 8, "And to you who are troubled, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed," &c. The things referred to in this quotation were all to take place *when* the Lord Jesus should be revealed. This revelation was the same that Christ spake of to his disciples, which should take place during the natural lives of some who heard him speak. And so it was understood by Paul. For he says to the same people, in chap. 3: v. 5, "And the Lord direct your hearts into the love of God, and into the patient *waiting for Christ.*" Now this injunction is consistent only on the ground that this coming was within the lifetime of the people addressed. How could the Thessalonians be said to be *waiting patiently* for the coming of Christ, if his coming has not yet taken place.

Again, "The second death," spoken of by John, is referred to as proof of his position. He inquires, "What is the second death?" I answer, it is the death of apostacy. The church at Ephesus, to which John wrote, had experienced this death. John says, "I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. Remember therefore from whence thou art fallen, and repent and do the first works." The church of Smyrna he also exhorts to be faithful and not fall as its sister church had; for "he that overcometh, (*viz. the opposition to the church*) shall not be hurt of the

second death." Hence it was true that "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection ; on such the *second death hath no power.*" Jude speaks of those who were "*twice dead*, plucked up by the roots." These had left their first love and had fallen. So we are not obliged to refer this second death to another mode of being, or the future world. We have *no proof at all* in the context that it is there, or that it is eternal. But we have *positive proof*, as I have shown, that it means apostacy—a falling away from truth and from "*first love.*"

The church in Sardis, Rev. 3: 1, had in the time of John experienced this death. I know thy works, that thou hast a name that thou livest, and art *dead.*" The fact of this second death was prophetically announced as existing in that very age. Paul to Timothy, 1st Eph. 4 : 1, says, "Now the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times," (and John says those very times had come in his day, 1 John 2 : 18,) "some shall depart from the faith," &c.

But supposing the second death meant a place of torments hereafter—"a lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." We are told that death and hell were to be cast into this lake of fire, and consequently were to be swallowed up of it and destroyed. And besides, lake, fire, and brimstone, all being material substances, must necessarily from their very nature have an end. A "lake of fire and brimstone," is no more to be consid-

ered *eternal*; than any other lake, or fire, or brimstone not connected with it. And here might be added the positive and unequivocal testimony of John himself against the eternal duration of this death, whatever it was. His eye looked forward and saw, and his lips pronounced, that "There shall be no more *death*, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." If he saw the period when there should be no more death, then he saw the second death overcome or destroyed. The reason was, "the former things *are passed away*. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, write; for these words are true and faithful."

Your attention is now invited to what this author has said in relation to the general judgment, as he calls it. "The general judgment," says he, "furnishes conclusive proof of the eternal punishment of the wicked." He says, "A specific day is appointed by the Almighty, which in scripture is styled, 'the day of judgment; the judgment of the great day.' On this day, men and angels, both good and bad, will be gathered around the judgment seat of Christ." This day and this judgment are in another world, he assumes. The question is begged, without any show of proof whatever. Taking such position, what doctrine can not be proved? Supposing I assert that God has appointed a specific day in a future world in which he will judge all men: and

then for proof of it I should quote the passage, "Because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness." Would you take this as affording any positive proof? Certainly not. If it were positively *determined and demonstrated* that there could be no other than the future immortal state in which God could or would judge the world, *then and not till then* would this passage be "*conclusive proof*."

But is there no other, and can it be determined and demonstrated that God has appointed none other? If it cannot be, then this passage is not conclusive proof. Supposing I assert that God has appointed a day of general judgment in the future world, and then for conclusive proof I should quote the nine passages which he has quoted in proof of his assertion: what have I proved? Just nothing at all conclusively, unless it may be my want of logical acumen to perceive that these passages are susceptible of a different interpretation. If they are, then the argument of my opponent is not positive and conclusive. Besides, there is a manifest error in his application of them, which implies that God does not judge men in this world at all, but has reserved all judgment for the future. But is this true? No man will dare affirm that it is, who believes his bible, and in the superintending care of God over the affairs of the world. What was the destruction of the Antediluvians by a flood—of the Sodomites by fire from heaven—of the Egyptians by drowning, preceded by

the dreadful plagues that were sent among them—the captivity of the Israelites in Babylon—their awful captivity and suffering at a later period when they fell a prey to the Roman army, and were either barbarously massacred or scattered as vassals and bondmen over nearly all the earth? Do not all these events declare in solemn truth, “Verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth”? So that all his judgments are not reserved for the future. Solomon said, Eccl 3 : 16, 17, that the place of judgment was under the sun, where wickedness was. Hence his day of judgment is where and when he judges.

But more especially is the gospel day, a day appointed to judge the world. Hence we read, “In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men *by Jesus Christ.*” This Son of God was appointed Judge over the new world or gospel age. And *when* he gave him this kingdom, “he committed all judgment unto the Son.” John 5 : 22. We are told in Isaiah, 32 : 1, “A king shall reign in righteousness.” And in Dan. 7 : 19, “There was given him,” viz. “the Son of man,” “dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him.”

Now if there were given to him a kingdom, it is reasonable to suppose that there was at the same time “given to him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.” John 5 : 27. For it would be inconsistent with the nature and fitness of

things to suppose that God would appoint unto his Son a kingdom and constitute him King, without also giving him authority to judge or execute judgment therein. Jesus said to his disciples, Luke 22 : 29, 30, "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, &c. Since God had committed all judgment to the Son, and appointed him a kingdom, it was necessary also that he should appoint a day or time to reign, or to "judge the world in righteousness *by that man whom he hath ordained.*" Accordingly the day of judgment commenced when the kingdom was given to the Son : and this judgment day or process of judging the secrets of all men, by Jesus Christ, will continue until he resigns the kingdom to the Father.

Hence we read, "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him." "The word of God is quick and powerful—and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." Does not such language show that there is a process of judging carried on where and when the word of Christ's gospel is taught, and where he has set up his kingdom and commenced ruling?—And what authority have we to say that this process of judging is in another world? We have none : but on the contrary have direct scripture proof that it is here in this world.

Jesus said, John 9: 39, "For judgment I am come into this world." Now, can we find as direct scripture proof that Christ has reserved his judgment for a future

world, and that men will there go to him to be judged. "Search the scriptures," and you will find that the New Testament writers all along with one accord represent that Christ should *come* to judge the world, and not that people should *go* into the future world to be judged. And furthermore, you will learn that *the judgment, and judgment seat of Christ*, were at the *beginning* rather than at the *close* of Christ's reign. In view of this fact, Paul, 2 Cor. 5:10, said to his brethren, "For we must all appear (or be made manifest) before the judgment seat of Christ," &c. Now to show that this appearing and this judgment seat are not in the future world, the apostle in the next verse explicitly says, "*We are made manifest* unto God; and I trust also are made *manifest* in your consciences." Here the word *manifest* is the same with *appear*, in the original. Hence the passage might be correctly read, thus; "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment seat of Christ;" by which nothing more was meant than that the apostles who had been instrumental in building up the Corinthian church, and who had been accused of deceit and dishonesty, acted with the perfect consciousness that their hearts were manifest and open to the inspection of Him who is the searcher of all hearts, and that they should positively receive in their bodies according to their acts, whether good or bad. And this fact of their being made manifest, was then present, and *declared* so to be. For the language is, "*We are*

made manifest unto God." If then these apostles were at that time "manifest," they were also arraigned before the judgment seat or tribunal of their spiritual Judge. We are told "God is not mocked"—he can not be deceived with the hypocritical pretensions of his creatures—their acts are all open to his inspection. We must therefore now and through life be made manifest before God. We cannot avoid it. "Known unto God are all his works, from the beginning of the world." Acts 15: 18. See also Ps. 139: 1—11.

We are referred to Jude 6; as proof that judgment is reserved for the immortal state. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day." But who were these angels? what were the everlasting chains? and what is meant by the judgment of the great day? I shall be told that the angels are such beings as once sinned in heaven, and according to Milton, "were expelled from that once happy society to our earth." The "everlasting chains" were such means as God had employed to confine them, and like prisoners, to keep them in durance till their final trial at the last judgment; and the day of judgment means the awful day of accounts after the resurrection. But this is all fanciful and visionary, without any proof from reason or scripture, and the highest authority it can claim for its support is the poet Milton. Let us

take a more rational and common sense view of this subject. The angels were such human messengers as once professed to receive a knowledge of the truth, but apostatized, experienced the second death spoken of—left their own spiritual habitation and sought shelter under another—and now were consequently reserved in the age-lasting chains of Roman servitude, and shut up in the same darkness of apostacy into which they had fallen; and thus like criminals confined, awaiting their trial, they were reserved to the great day of judgment which was to come upon that generation, when there should be such a scene of trouble as had never before been witnessed since the creation.

But it may be objected that the angels were “reserved in *everlasting* chains,” consequently there will never be any release for them; they must eternally remain in chains. But the word *everlasting* here, no more signifies eternal or endless, than it does when applied to *mountains*, or the *priesthood* of Aaron, or the fire upon the Jewish altar of sacrifice. Chains may be *everlasting*, without men being *everlastingly* bound with them. We say that slavery exists in America, and has existed not only for an age but for ages past. Hence we might say that the chains of slavery are *age-lasting*, or *everlasting*. But does this fact prove that slavery itself shall eternally continue? We say, “God is from *everlasting* to *everlasting*,” and is a consuming fire;” but does this prove that God shall be *everlasting*?

ly consuming us? But I need pursue my remarks no further upon this point.

The next passage to which your attention is invited and which has been quoted to prove an after-death judgment, is in Heb. 9 : 27. "And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment." This passage can not, by any fair interpretation, be made to favor the doctrine in question. And I object to the unfairness and deceptive manner in which this text is here quoted. It is abstracted from its connexion, and which alone forms an imperfect sentence. It is only one member or portion of a sentence containing a comparison indicated by the words "as" and "so."—The whole sentence reads thus :—"And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment ; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many ; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation." Here the sense is complete, and we are taught the fact that a comparison is drawn between the death of the men referred to, (meaning the high-priests before spoken of,) and the offering or death of Christ. Hence, in order to prove a comparison, the death of the men or high-priests must have been *sacrificial*, for the death of Christ was sacrificial. There is also a comparison between the "*judgment*" that should follow the sacrificial death of these high-priests, and the appearing of Christ

"the second time, without sin, unto salvation." And this judgment, instead of being an arbitrary sentence of condemnation pronounced on the wicked after the resurrection, it was a sentence or declaration of acceptance which the high-priest, after he returned from the most holy place, where his sacrifice was offered, pronounced upon the people for whose sins the sacrifice was made, and who stood waiting at the door of the tabernacle for his return. The language was this: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee; the Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee; the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace." Num. 6: 24, 25, 26. Hence the appearing of the high-priest a second time to bless the people, was referred to as a figure of "Christ's appearing the second time, without sin, unto salvation."—And as the high-priest pronounced his blessing upon *all* for whom the sacrifice was made, and who stood looking for his return; so also shall Christ appear; not only without a sin-offering, but also with a salvation offering to all for whom he gave himself a sacrifice. If this be not true, then the comparison which the apostle has introduced to illustrate his subject is false, or without meaning. It is assumed that the death spoken of in the first member of the sentence, is natural death, the dissolution of the body, and the death "appointed" unto all men. This view has no foundation in truth or reason. It makes the apostle say that the natural death

of all men is compared with the *sacrificial* death of Christ. Besides, if natural death is meant, why did the apostle use the word "*once*," and say it is appointed unto men *once* to die? Mr. Stearns would say we were appointed not only to one death in consequence of original transgression, but to *two* and even a *trinity* of deaths, viz: death natural, death spiritual, and death eternal. If this be true, or if only death natural be referred to, I see no reason why the word *once* should be used. But if a *sacrificial* death be meant, all is perfectly consistent and reasonable. For this death was "*appointed*" in the law. It was a death which occurred *once* every year. The high-priest went into the second or inner court of the tabernacle "*alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself and for the errors of the people.*" The offering of this blood signified the death referred to, as the offering could not be made without death or the shedding of blood. This "*once*" offering, or "*offering year by year continually,*" was contrasted with Christ's one offering. He "*by his own blood,*" not as the high-priest by the blood of others, "*but by his own blood, entered in once into the holy place.* Now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. We are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ *once for all.* After he had offered one sacrifice for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God." Hebrews

there is a consistency in this comparison of the one sacrificial offering under the law, with the one offering of Christ. For a further illustration of this subject, see and read carefully the whole of the 7th, 8th, 9th and 10th chapters in this epistle, and also Ex. 28th and 29th chapters, Lev. 16th and Num. 23d chapters.

I now come to notice the 20th chapter of Revelations, which is referred to as containing proof of a future general judgment. The language in this chapter is highly figurative; but my opponent understands it literally. The fleeing away of earth and heaven spoken of, means the dissolution of the Jewish kingdom or dispensation, subsequent to which should be the appearing of the new heaven and earth, or new dispensation, before which the small and the great, the Gentile and the Jew, all stood guilty in unbelief, for God had "included all together in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all."

But great stress is put upon the phrase, "And death and hell gave up the dead which were in them; and they were judged, every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." But what does my opponent expect to make out of this passage? Does it afford any proof of his doctrine? I can not see that it does. We are here told that "whosoever was not found written in the book of life,

was cast into the lake of fire." And we are told also that "*death and hell* were cast into the lake of fire" after they had given up their dead. According to this, death and hell were appointed to the same destruction with those who were not found written in the book of life. All alike were to be swallowed up in the lake of fire. But so far from the facts contained in this chapter affording any proof of the eternity of hell torments, they favor the idea of hell's destruction, and a final victory over death.

We are next cited to Matt. 24th and 25th chapters for proof of the general judgment, even to the answers given by Christ in reference to the *temporal destruction of Jerusalem, and his coming in judgment on that generation*. But he says these passages which he has cited, "point us to a day beyond the grave and the resurrection of the dead, in which God will judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ." I deny it, and wait for proof. They do *not* point us to such a day, as Christ himself has positively asserted, chap. 24: 14, 15, 34. They have no reference whatever "to a day beyond the grave," or the literal resurrection of the dead.

He has quoted almost every passage in the New Testament where the words judge, judgment, &c., occur, and seems to assume that no other sense can be attached to those words, than such as he has given. He quotes at random; relevant or irrelevant to the point, it is all the same. They are to him spiritual vehicles, convey-

ing his thoughts or his mind into the future far beyond Time's events. He has only to put himself on board, and he is off as quick as thought into the unexplored regions of futurity. He makes no stop by the way—has nothing to do with TIME.

After summing up his arguments, he very earnestly says, "Reader! be not deceived by the cunning craftiness of satan!" As though he anticipated some cunning, crafty Universalist, the emissary of satan, might attempt to overthrow his arguments and expose his numerous sophisms. He would give his readers timely caution to be on their guard. And I have no doubt if he were in this village now, he would use his exertions to prevent people from hearing these lectures, lest "the cunning craftiness of satan," [Universalists I suppose] might "overthrow the faith of some."—What means this shyness—his spiritual cowardice—this refusal to hear our doctrine preached and to read our books, if it is not believed that there is a kind of "cunning craftiness" among us by which many may be deluded? We use no craft, my hearers, such as it is said satan useth. We are a plain and unostentatious people. What we have to say, we say boldly, openly, fearlessly, and undeceivably—using our reason in matters of religion, and hear both sides of an argument, and then judge for ourselves on which side the truth preponderates. We have nothing to do with the "craft" of hiring people to keep away from our op-

ponents' meetings—of threatening to turn them out of employment or to withdraw our support from them in their various avocations—of hiding from them books and papers advocating sentiments differing from our own—of building meeting houses professedly free for all religious denominations, getting their money from them by false pretences, and afterwards close the doors against them—or of threatening to excommunicate and anathematize all who should venture to attend any religious meetings except our own. We are guilty of no such craft as this. And God knows that it is not our intention to deceive people, but to undeceive—not to keep people in blindness, but to enlighten them—not to perpetuate error and bigotry, but to establish truth, forbearance, charity and good will among men. Our hope and our rejoicing shall be, that

“Truth, crushed to earth shall rise again,
Th’ eternal years of God are hers;
While error wounded writhes in pain,
And dies amid her worshippers.”

LECTURE XI.

I shall commence this lecture with remarks upon the chapter entitled, “*Eternal punishment argued from the fact, that a place in which the wicked will be punished is in existence, where devils and the wicked do are now suffering.*”

Our author has quoted almost every passage in the bible in which the words devil, satan, &c. are found, and then says, "These scriptures prove, that there are such *beings* in existence as devils or fallen angels." Well, supposing they do; do they prove that the doctrine of eternal punishment is true? Does the existence of a personal devil prove endless torment? As well might we say that the existence of wicked men such as Saul was, proves it. Because the angels that sinned were cast down to hell, it is no more proof of eternal punishment, than is the fact of David's being cast into hell. He was cast into the *lowest hell*." Why then did he not refer to David for proof, as well as to wicked angels? I know of no good reason why, unless it is because it is said that David was "*delivered from hell*." This circumstance he knew would overthrow his argument in support of the eternity of hell-imprisonment, and therefore he did not refer to it. Yet he has cut off all his proof drawn from the circumstance that devils are cast into hell, by asserting that they shall be delivered or brought out. So that in fact there is no more proof to lean upon in their case, than in that of David. He says, "Though the devil is cast down to hell and reserved in chains, yet he is *not confined there* as he will be after the judgment. This implies that they will be delivered therefrom. Besides he has himself plainly told us, that "Devils, or fallen angels who are now in hell, *will be brought forth to*

the general judgment." Here he himself gets the devils and fallen angels out of hell; and besides, he has told us that after hell had given up its prey, it was to be cast into the lake of fire, and of course the identity and locality of hell are at once destroyed, and consequently confinement therein ceases. He has nullified his own argument. And he seems not to have any very clear ideas upon the subject on which he treats. He has some strange contradictions. At one time he says, "When the wicked die they go immediately to hell, where they lift up their eyes in torment—There is no passing from" the place. "The state of those in hell is *unalterable*." At another time he says, that "Devils or fallen angels who are now in hell will be brought forth." Hence, at one time he has them all sent speedily to hell, and their state unalterably fixed so that they can not get out—"there is no passing" from their horrible prison—and then again he has them "brought forth," their chains fall off and they issue from their sulphureous regions, a mighty army. And thus may hell continue to be depopulated to all eternity, for aught I can see in his argument to the contrary.

On page 78, speaking of the general judgment, he says, "Oh! how grand and solemn will be the day [it will surely come] when the reader, and the writer, and all created intelligences from every part of the universe, will be seen gathering in solemn procession around 'the great white throne,' there to give an account to the Searcher of all hearts, whose eyes are as a

flame of fire." If this be so, if "*all created intelligences* from *every* part of the universe will be seen gathering in solemn procession," than the devils in hell will leave their dismal abode and come up to form a part of that "solemn procession." Will christians come from every part and meet with them as they come forth from their sooty regions, and walk hand in hand up to "the great white throne?" There would be strange solemnity, I trow, and greater *unity* than we sometimes witness on earth between differing religionists; for unfortunately we have seen some professedly the most pious who could hardly pass each other civilly upon the side-walk.

That would be a strange sight, and more strange than "solemn," I think, to see the countless hosts of devils in hell, after having suspended their unholy warfare and dropped their chains, commence their march in "solemn procession" (!) towards some place, [best conceived in the poet's fancy,] to meet with the angels in the skies, and the righteous and the wicked on earth, and thus form one great assembly, composed of "all created intelligences from *every part* of the universe" that have lived since the creation. This is altogether fanciful, and has neither reason nor philosophy to sustain it. And besides, it presupposes that God has a particular local habitation; that he can not decide on the characters of his creatures individually in any and every place of his vast domain—that he needs counsel and wit-

nesses the same as an earthly judge, that he may be able to judge righteously in relation to every man's case.

Alike visionary and fanciful is the description he has given of the employment of the devils in hell, previous to the general judgment. He says, "They are rebels against God, but have not had their trials."—[How does he know they are rebels if they have not yet had their trial—are not yet proved guilty? It is customary to consider a man innocent till the court proves him guilty.] "They are prisoners in chains, and are now carrying on a war against the kingdom of Christ, as far as the length of their chains will allow." Will he please tell us how long those chains are? If he will, then we can tell exactly how far hell is from earth, and thus satisfy many curious and inquiring minds wishing to know, but are as yet in the dark.—Hesiod and Virgil both describe hell as being down as far below the earth as heaven is above it. But how they obtained this knowledge—whether they measured the exact distance by the devils' chains or by a telescopic discovery, we are not informed.

Again, he says, speaking in reference to the place where devils are tormented, "When wicked men die, they go immediately to the same place of torment." From this it appears that wicked men and devils go immediately to hell at death, and go there without a trial—are taken out without a trial—flock together to receive their trial, with untried millions who have never

been there, and are sent back after trial to try the place they had long tried before. What is there in all this that commends itself to the reason and common sense of men? It is supposed that Cain, the murderer, went immediately to hell at death, and also Judas Iscariot. Then each has been in that place of torment without a trial for thousands of years, and for aught we know will continue there a million of years longer without a trial, "warring against the kingdom of Christ as far as the length of their chains will allow." An earthly magistrate would be considered unkind and unwise who should send a thief without a trial to our state prison for fifty years, and after that, summon him to trial, that he might know how guilty he was, and how much punishment he deserved; and then after a full trial pronounce sentence against him, remanding him back to prison without giving him any hope of deliverance. Besides, he would be beneath our respect were he to send the thief to prison and there give him a chain long enough to allow him to roam over all the earth, into the secret haunts of the vicious, and sometimes into the dwellings of the virtuous, seducing and leading thousands to follow his pernicious ways, and plundering perpetually. But this is exactly the view given of the devils in hell—those "prisoners in chains."

Again, my opponent says (page 82) that "Devils or fallen angels," after they have been judged and sentenced, will go back to hell to "receive their full pun-

ishment." But on the next page he has contradicted this assertion. For, says he, "After the wicked shall have suffered ages multiplied by ages, they will be no nearer the end of their sufferings than when they commenced." As much as to say, they will have come no nearer their *full* punishment. It is utterly impossible for them to receive in full if their sufferings are endless, as any one possessed of the least discernment can see. It is, therefore, nonsense to talk about wicked men and devils receiving their "full punishment," if their punishment be endless. Hence if he sticks to his position that they will receive their *full* punishment, he must give up and say that punishment is not endless.

I must notice some other contradictions and absurdities. He says on page 81, "Between the wicked and the righteous there is a gulf fixed, so there is no passing from one to the other." Yet on page 78, he says, as before quoted, "All created intelligences from every part of the universe, will be seen gathering in solemn procession around "the great white throne." "All created intelligences" must include the righteous and the wicked—devils and fallen angels. And "every part of the universe" must include hell, unless he maintain that hell is *not in the universe* at all; this he will not do, surely. Hence there will be a passing of the righteous to the wicked, or of the wicked to the *righteous*, to form this "gathering" and this "solemn procession" of which he speaks.

And besides, there is another contradiction. He says, "the wicked when they die, go immediately to hell." And he is equally as confident on the other hand, that when the righteous die they go immediately to heaven. Here they are, then; one class is in heaven, the other in hell. How then shall they get together? Notwithstanding there will be a gathering of the two classes, he says there will be "no going from hell to heaven." How can "all created intelligences" meet, how can they "gather," how form this "solemn procession" without passing from one place to the other? The righteous must go from heaven to hell, if there be "no going from hell to heaven." We will grant that he is correct, that there is "no going from hell to heaven," and also suppose there is no going from heaven to hell, —where, then, we inquire, will the two classes meet to be judged? Midway between heaven and hell? so that neither the righteous nor the wicked will be either in heaven or in hell? the righteous having suspended their heavenly employment, and the wicked their unholy war? This will be to bring the two classes nearly on a level; the righteous are neither enjoying the happiness of heaven nor suffering the pains of hell; nor are the wicked enduring the pains of hell or enjoying the felicities of heaven.

But we will leave this particular point, and notice one most singular argument he has introduced to prove the *eternity of punishment*, which is more ludicrous than

convincing. He has introduced the devil as a witness to the truth of this doctrine, and quoted the language of that arch deceiver, which is as follows: "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?"—Matt. 8: 29. He supposes from this language that the devil believed in future endless punishment, and that he was sensible "the day of retribution had not arrived;" therefore he put forth this interrogation, as though he suspected that Christ might have come to punish him in this world—an idea which he never thought of cherishing. How then is Universalism the devil's doctrine if he never cherished it, and never believed that Christ came into this world to execute judgment? Really, our author has blundered into the strange position that the devil has no confidence in our doctrine at all, but is a staunch believer in the doctrine of future endless pain, and he has here introduced him as an *important*, if not *infallible* witness of its truth. Verily, our reverend author ought to bow in humble gratitude, and devoutly thank his satanic majesty all the days of his life, that he has done him so much valuable service, and aided him so effectually in proving that darling, dearly beloved, and long cherished sentiment of endless torture! But I will leave him in the undisturbed enjoyment of all the honors, satisfaction and advantages he may derive from this source to which he has applied for proof of his favorite theory.

I will now invite your attention to one of the stron-

gest, plainest proofs supposed to be found in all the bible, and one which is ofteneft employed in support of eternal hell torments. I mean the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. And here let it be said, to the credit of my opponent, that he has admitted this account of the rich man and Lazarus is really a parable. This is an admission which but few of his faith have made. If we say this account is a parable, then the words used in it, such as rich man—Lazarus—died—buried—hell—&c. are used parabolically; they are designed to represent something, and are not the things which they represent. Hence it is clear that the “rich man” was not an individual, literal man, but a representative of a body of men. The same may be said of Lazarus.—“Died,” was not the literal act of passing from this state of being to another, but represented a moral and political dissolution. “Buried,” was not the literal act of burial, but represented a deep moral depravity and corruption. “Hell,” was not used literally, but representatively.

According to the parabolic use of these terms, by the rich man is meant the Jews, or that portion of them called Scribes and Pharisees. And Lazarus, or the poor man, represented the Gentiles, or those whom the Scribes reproachfully called “publicans and sinners.” These were the two classes before our Savior when the words under consideration were spoken, and their relative condition suggested this parable or simili-

tude. The Pharisees fancied themselves rich in all worldly and spiritual good, being the chosen people of God, and having the divine oracles committed to them. They had their "purple and fine linen" of which they boasted, and to all outward appearance "fared sumptuously every day." But the publicans were comparatively poor; were beggars, and menial servants, and represented as laying at the gate of their richer neighbors, full of sores, the putrifying sores of sin. A Gentile was not permitted to *enter* the gate of a Jew, he must remain outside, for he was considered a pollution. The "dogs" would show more kindness to him in his distress, and it is so represented. But in process of time the condition of these despised Gentiles was to be improved; they were to die to that condition and be exalted or translated by God's messengers into Abraham's bosom, or adopted into the covenant of the gospel and the faith of Abraham; for it was declared that the kingdom should be taken from the Jews and given to the Gentiles.

The rich man, the representative of the Jew, also died. But his death was different from that of the Gentile. It was a deprivation of former blessings, a being buried beneath the overwhelming judgment that Christ had denounced against unbelieving Israel. In this very *hades* in which he was buried—this dark and dismal state, he lifted up his eyes—perceived more clearly his *present awful condition* compared with his former, and

saw Abraham, his spiritual father, and the despised Gentile embraced and received into favor by him. In his life time, in the days of his national prosperity, he received his good things, and the Gentile his evil things; but now the time had come as long foretold in prophecy for the latter to be comforted or spiritually exalted, and the former to be tormented or reduced to extreme wretchedness. In this state he still clings with all his prejudice to his own kindred, and looks to such, and such only for succor, calling upon *Abraham* to help his brethren, and employ the beggar-Gentile to be his servant.

Hence, this parable was given to illustrate by contrast the condition of the Jewish and Gentile people—the downfall and obstinacy of the former, and the exaltation of the latter to greater spiritual favor. Our Savior used the term *hades*, (hell) for the purpose of impressing upon the minds of his hearers more forcibly the truths which he would inculcate, not intending however to sanction the views which some of the people of his age entertained. *Hades* was formerly considered a place of darkness, of silence and repose—a place to which all good and bad go at death. But in process of time there were given to it animation and life. This idea had obtained to some extent in our Savior's time. Hence he uses it as a place animated with life, not however as a *real thing*, but as something which the Greeks had built in their fancy. *As such*, he used it for a figure. For who will maintain that

Christ intended to sanction the wild reveries and chimerical notions of the Greeks concerning the unseen world? Not one of his disciples adopted these notions and preached them in any of their discourses. Paul in all his 14 epistles has not used the word at all except once, (1 Cor. 15: 55,) where it is translated grave, and then used to show its destruction. Peter has employed it once (Acts 2: 27) in his quotation from Psalms, and employed it in the sense in which it was originally used. There it was spoken of as the receptacle of our Savior into which he descended at death. Was that then *literally* a "place of torment," where the tongue is "parched," and "flames" of fire ascend? where there are eyes to "see," where conversation is held with such as are "afar off"—where hearts beat with love and the prayer of compassion is breathed? No; the apostles entertained no such view, and attached no such meaning to the word.

I will here introduce the remarks of some eminent commentators upon the meaning and use of the Greek word *hades*, translated hell. Says Dr. Campbell, a Scotch divine, and a believer in the doctrine of endless misery, that "*Hades ought never in the scripture to be rendered hell, at least in the sense wherein that word is now universally understood by christians. The word hell, in its primitive signification, perfectly corresponded with the original meaning of hades. For, at first, it denoted only what was secret, or concealed.*" Again,

he says, "It is plain, that in the Old Testament the most profound silence is observed in regard to the state of the deceased, their joys, or sorrows, happiness or misery. *Hades* signifies the state of the dead in general, *without regard* to the goodness or badness of persons, their happiness or misery." That this opinion is correct as regards the primitive and scriptural meaning of *hades*, is evident from Peter's use of it where he speaks of Christ as descending into hell, [*hades*.]—Another author says, "All learned Hebricians know that *sheol* (or *hades*) is more proper for *the grave* than for hell; and that the Hebrews have no word proper for hell, *as we take hell*." Wakefield in his remarks upon this parable says, "It must be remembered that *hades* no where means hell, (*gehenna*,) in any author whatsoever, *sacred* or *profane*. The universal meaning of *hades* is, *the state of death*." With this agrees the opinion of Dr. Whitby, who says, "Sheol throughout the Old Testament, and *hades* in the Septuagint, answering to it, signify *not the place of punishment*, or of the souls of *bad men only*, but the *grave only*, or the place of death." He adds, "*hades* is the place whither *we are ALL going*. The ancient Greeks assigned one *hades* to all that died, and therefor say, *hades receives all mortal men together, all men shall go to hades*."

Thus have I presented before you the united testimony of these learned commentators, all believers in the doctrine of eternal punishment. They have all de-

clared as with one voice that *hades*, here translated hell, does not signify a place of punishment at all, was not used in this sense by any of the inspired persons. The agreement therefore is quite conclusive. The parable before us affords no proof of the doctrine of eternal punishment. And my opponent can not use it in proof of this doctrine without opposing the numerous indubitable facts and the clearest historical testimony concerning the true meaning of the word *hades*. I can not so use it without charging Christ with sanctioning the mythological views of the benighted heathen with regard to the unseen world.

Believing that enough has now been offered upon this parable to make its sense clear to your understanding and also to show that the doctrine of endless misery derives no support from it—I now invite your attention to my opponent's use of the terms "eternal, everlasting, for ever, for ever and ever," &c. He says, "The future punishment of the wicked is expressed in scriptures by these terms." This is entirely assumed and without proof, if by "future punishment" is meant punishment beyond this life and the resurrection. He says moreover that "The advocates of universal salvation insist, that these terms are often used to denote limited duration, and therefore do not prove that the future punishment of the wicked will be endless." Yet *and we still "insist" that the original words from which they are derived, "are used in a limited sense*

and so does he; for he will not hazard his reputation as a biblical scholar by saying they are *not* used in a limited sense. If, as all admit, "These terms are often used to denote a limited duration," then in that admission is a concession that the terms do not of themselves *absolutely* prove endless duration, and of course what is not absolute proof, is equivocal and uncertain. Hence all the proof he can derive from these terms in support of the endless duration of punishment, is at best *uncertain proof*, which is no better than no proof at all to lean upon.

The real sense of these terms can be understood only by the nature of the subjects to which they are applied. If they are applied to things of a perishable, changing, and transitory nature, they must be understood in a limited sense. But when applied to God and to things that are absolutely imperishable and unchangeable in their very nature, they denote an unlimited duration. What is there in the nature of punishment itself to lead us to conclude that it is endless? any more than any thing else is, which has existed and ceased to be? Surely nothing. He says, "When these terms are applied to the things of a future state, either to the happiness of the righteous or to the miseries of the wicked, they are to be understood in a literal sense, as signifying endless duration." Now before this language can have any force in his favor, he must first *prove what he assumes to be already proved, that these*

terms do relate to future miseries of the wicked: but him prove this, then his argument drawn from the application of these terms will have some claim to consideration. And then even after he has proved all this, after he has shown that these terms are applied to future punishment, then he would have to prove from the nature of punishment that they must be absolutely endless—a thing which neither he nor any other man can do. I need only observe further in this place that *endless*, *incorruptible*, *infinite*, *immortal*, &c., are never applied to punishment. Hence we never read in the bible of *endless* punishment, or of *incorruptible*, *infinite*, or *immortal* punishment. But we read of “the power of an *endless* life;” of “an inheritance, *incorruptible*, and that *fadeth not away*,” and of “the *incorruptible* God,” &c. If then the sacred authors intended to teach the absolute endless duration of punishment, why did they not use the *strongest* terms in human language? If, as he says in his preface, “The doctrine is of infinite importance, and should be clearly understood by every creature under heaven”—why did not those writers state it in language that could not be misunderstood? Why did they not somewhere, among so much as has been said about punishment, use the terms *akatalutos*, and *aperantos*, which are in their signification strictly endless, and apply them directly and unequivocally to the punishment of the wicked? If they believed the doctrine of endless punishment of infer-

importance, as my opponent does, they would have done it; and I can not while I maintain their strict devotion to truth, account for this neglect, only on the ground that *they did not believe the doctrine.*

"The word *aion*, translated everlasting, &c., is used in connexion with punishment but twice in the Old Testament. It is used but three times in Matthew's gospel—once in Mark's, and once only in all the fourteen epistles of Paul, and not even once in all his preaching recorded in the Acts. Neither Luke in his gospel, nor John in his gospel or his epistles, has used it. It is not found in the writings of James or Peter." Is not this fact unaccountably strange, if they believed and preached the doctrine of endless punishment and expressed it by the term *aion*, in connexion with punishment? Admitting the word means *endless* when applied to punishment, this unfrequency of its use alone would persuade one that the doctrine is not of divine origin.

We know that they used the term in a limited sense; hence we read. "Now once in the end of the world," &c. "Upon whom the ends of the world," &c.—Here the apostle speaks of the *end* of *aion*, which is the word for world in both these passages. And here let me add a concession, found in the "New York Evangelist" of July 25th, 1844. "That long series of years, that succession of centuries and ages, which the Greeks call *aion*, and which we call *world*, with its

teeming generations and its great events, *must end.*"—

This is as candid as it is true, and expresses all that I need to say further in reference to this particular. I would gladly, if I had time, comment at large upon those passages which he has introduced in support of the endless duration of punishment, and in which are found the terms *ever, everlasting, forever, eternal, &c.* To do so, would require more time than I could reasonably devote, and do full justice to them all. The remarks already made in reference to these terms must suffice, as they cover essentially the whole ground of argument found in the numerous passages which he has quoted.

I shall also pass over his manifest perversion of our views when he speaks of the term "*perish*"—of our use of the term "*fire*," when spoken of in connexion with punishment, that it is the fire of God's love, &c., and of our garbling the scriptures, quoting detached passages, and wresting them from their connexion to prove our doctrine.

I will invite you to what he is pleased to term a contrast between the preaching of the apostles and that of Universalists. He says, "There is a great contrast between the preaching of Christ and his apostles, and that of Universalists, especially in the results. The contrast is as great as can well be imagined. And this is conclusive evidence that the latter do not preach the gospel of the blessed God. I will notice some things in which this contrast will be made to appear."

Now supposing I strike out of this sentence the word Universalists, and substitute the word Partialists, and then read—"There is a great contrast between the preaching of Christ and his apostles, and that of Partialists, especially in the results. The contrast is as great as can well be imagined. And this is conclusive evidence that the latter do not preach the gospel of the blessed God." Now we are just even. He has made an assertion, and I have made one. And I think I can make it appear that mine has full as much truth in it as his. And he must not blame me if I, in a friendly mood, take the same course with him that he has with me. Or, in other words, he will not be offended if I pluck "the beam" out of his own eye, that he may see clearly the defects of his own system and its woful consequences. And I hope ever to possess discrimination enough to discern the difference between picking the beam out of one's eye and picking one's eye out. To use his language, "I will notice some things in which this contrast will be made to appear." When Christ and his apostles preached, their preaching did not drive men to insanity and suicide. But how is it now?—What is the effect of preaching the doctrine of endless suffering? Let the fresh grave of the suicide speak. Let the Lunatic Asylums over all our land tell the doleful tale. Let the Worcester Asylum in Mass. speak, where in 1844 there were 28 of 220 confined, who were made religiously insane; and Mr. Wood-

ward, one of the chief officers of that institution, states, that there is a larger proportion still in some of the Asylums in New England. The report from the Hartford Lunatic Asylum for 1841, is that there were in that institution 87 made insane by intemperance, and the same number by religious excitement. The Directors and Superintendent of the Ohio Lunatic Asylum reported for 1842, 32 cases were caused by intemperance, and 54 by religious excitement.

Here we may behold the blighting effects of error; for surely these cannot be the effects of preaching "the gospel of the blessed God." Almost every day for the last 18 years the press has had to record the insanity or premature death of some fond mother, or father, or brother, or sister, who has been crushed down, a mere wreck of what was once lovely and beautiful, noble and great, and fallen untimely to the earth, the victim of cruel error. Tell me not these are the effects of God's truth! Nay, such effects followed not the preaching by Christ and his apostles; and Universalism has had nothing to do in producing them. She is not thus stained with the blood of the innocent. She stands guiltless and unaccused. Her hands have not been employed in this unholy work. She has lifted her warning and pleading voice against it. And she has saved many who were on the verge of despair from the awful vortex. Names and dates could be given if necessary.

Now in the language of this author we would earnestly inquire, "Is not this contrast as great as can well be imagined? And may we not find in "this conclusive evidence that the" doctrine which produces such horrible effects, is not "the gospel of the blessed God?" I appeal to your benevolence and reason for an answer. Where is there one solitary case of insanity and suicide occasioned by the preaching of the apostles, even through the long period of seventy years? And were there any such effects that followed the preaching of their successors for the first three hundred years? In vain will you search the history of the labors of those primitive teachers to find such effects.—Rather did the gospel which they preached raise up those who were bowed down with mental infirmity and despair, and clothe them in their "right minds"—the dumb were made "*to sing*," not to utter the horrible yellings of despair, and the believer was made "*to rejoice*," not to pine away in unmitigated sorrow. It gave men "the oil of joy for mourning, and the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness."

Again: the doctrine of ceaseless woe makes its believer exceedingly unhappy. It is bitterness and poison in the cup of human experience. Even Mr. Stearns himself has admitted it. "The subject is truly awful," says he. Again, "The subject is awful beyond expression. ETERNAL PUNISHMENT!!! the sound falls upon the ear, terrible as the thunder that rolled on Si-

mai. Who can harbor a desire that such a sentiment should be true?" I answer, *no one* who has a spark of benevolence in his heart. The doctrine is opposed by all the best desires and feelings of the human breast—opposed by all the benevolence of God, and angels, and men. An inspired apostle has said that "charity [or benevolence] rejoiceth not in iniquity but *rejoiceth in the truth.*" True doctrine only can give joy to the benevolent soul. Therefore according to his own admission this doctrine of endless pain is not true. It does not give joy to its believer. Dr. Dwight, as I have before quoted, says, "This subject is immeasurably awful, and beyond all others affecting. Few persons can behold it in clear vision with a steady eye. The subject is unquestionably *perplexing* as well as *distressing.*" Hence in the language of Saurin we might add, "I cease to wonder that the fear of hell hath made some men mad, and others melancholy."

Now compare this with the faith of the gospel and its effects among the primitive believers. "We who have believed do enter into rest. Believing, we rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory." I thank God that there is that in the faith of the gospel which will fill the soul with glory and joy unspeakable—that we no where see the apostles pressed down half dead with despair, or hear them in deep agony of soul exclaim that the faith of the gospel "*is awful beyond expression*"—that its "*sound falls upon the ear, terrible as the thunder that*

rolled upon *Staat*—that “it is distressing, perplexing,” containing “a mortal poison,” making “some men mad, and others melancholy.”

Is it not then clearly and undeniably true, as I before stated, that “There is a great contrast between the preaching of Christ and his apostles, and that of “Partialists,” especially in the results !”

Again he says, “Wicked men did not *relish* the preaching of Christ and his apostles”—but he represents that wicked men now *relish* the doctrine of Universalism, and hence draws the conclusion that Universalism differs from the preaching of the apostles. But it must be remembered that we live under circumstances almost entirely different from those in the days of the apostles, and consequently the same causes will not be invariably followed by the same effects. This is seen in the fact that when the Baptists and Methodists both first began to preach their distinguished tenets, the mighty host of those whom they would call “the wicked” were arrayed against them—they “did not relish” their doctrine. But how is it now ? The scene is greatly charged. Were the same men now on earth and surrounded by the same circumstances, they would have the same *disrelish* and the same persecuting spirit. So if the Jews were now on earth who were in the time of the apostles, and surrounded by the same circumstances, retaining still their Jewish notions, they would raise the same opposition to us that they did to our Sa-

vior, for they opposed him chiefly because he taught the universality of God's grace and salvation—that the blessing of God should rest upon the Gentiles as well as the Jews and *both* should be reconciled together in one body.

But supposing the most wicked and profligate, “Instead of being disgusted and offended at our doctrine, are highly pleased with it,” as he says; does it prove the doctrine true or false? No, neither. But I am not disposed to admit that such men as he describes are highly pleased with it. I have found the contrary true. I have even seen it in this place, and I have witnessed it in many other places. Once while I was preaching in the village of C., where I spent the first four years of my ministry, a man came into my meeting in a state of intoxication, and while I was expatiating upon the truth of the doctrine, he vociferated with an oath, “*That is a lie.*” And after a few minutes the same language was repeated, when he was taken by the hand gently and led out of the house. This man you will perceive was a “drunkard,” and a “profane man.” Hence it is *not true*, as this author states, that “The drunkard, the gambler, the profane man, the thief, and the murderer, flee to it as their only refuge.” As regards the profane man, it may be observed that if he use oaths they are Orthodox oaths, he never derived them from Universalism. Orthodoxy must father them all and bear all the responsibility. As a Partialist clergy-

man once said in substance, that Universalists have no oaths, if they use any they steal them from the Orthodox, and are Orthodox oaths. If such thieves flee to Universalism they find no "refuge" there. Their safest refuge would be among kindred spirits where their habits were formed. And as regards "the gambler and the murderer fleeing to this doctrine as their only refuge," if they do so it is simply because they have fancied a refuge where no refuge for them exists. And this fancy has been created by the false view given of our doctrine by our opposers. So if there is anything wrong in this matter we are not to blame.

A Universalist minister by the name of Freeman, once made this observation, on seeing many flock to his meeting who were cold, corrupt, ignorant and careless professors of the doctrine, and some who made no profession—said he: "I am going to preach Universalism to this people, and I will either *reform* them, God helping me, or *preach them out of the house*." He commenced the work like a true soldier of Christ, and some, after coming a few times became displeased, disgusted, and finding nothing taught there to encourage them in sin, left the meeting, muttering many hard sayings against the doctrine, while others were reformed.

This I have *always* found to be the effect of the doctrine when taught in its naked simplicity and truth. This was *exactly* the effect of the apostles' preaching. Hence we read, "Some mocked, and others said, we

will hear thee again of this matter." Acts 17: 34.
"And some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not." Acts 28: 29.

But I will not dwell longer here. Again, our author says, "The preaching of Christ and his apostles frequently *enraged* their hearers. When the Savior preached to the wicked Jews, they sought to lay violent hands on him, to stone him and to take his life." And after referring to many other violent acts, he inquires, "Now does the preaching of Universalists *enrage* the minds of men to this degree? Do they become subjects of this kind of treatment?" I answer yes. Universalists have received the most ungodly persecution both in public and private, as this pamphlet before me itself shows. They have been "stoned" and "violent hands" have been laid on them. While John Murray was preaching in Boston, his "enraged" persecutors hurled a stone through the window into the desk where he was standing. It however fell harmlessly at his feet.

Similar acts have been often committed against different individuals at different times. But he inquires again: "Have they been hated, persecuted, and even put to death, by wicked men for preaching that God will save all men?" I answer, "They have been hated and persecuted by wicked men," and the evidence may be seen in this place, and every other place where Universalism has been preached since the days of the

apostles. They are now hated and persecuted by the same people characteristically that hated and persecuted Jesus, the author of our faith. His bitterest foes were the self-righteous, "The chief priests, the scribes and pharisees, the doctors of the law, the rulers of the people"—in a word—the *self-styled Orthodox of the age*. But he inquires, "Have they been put to death by wicked men for preaching that God will save all men?" I answer yes; and he must have been very ignorant of history or he would not have made the inquiry. Look at the history of this "sect which has been everywhere spoken against," from the days of Origen down to the present. Passing over a long and dark age in which it was death for any man to publicly avow his belief in the doctrine, in which also many were tried, condemned and banished—let us come down to the age of the reformation, when the Anabaptists of Germany were expressly condemned in the XVII Art. of the Augustin Confession for maintaining this doctrine. Many "were imprisoned, banished, slain by the sword, and burned." Even the Senate of Basil, in the exercise of the cruel spirit of endless torture, would not let the bones of one David George remain undisturbed in the silence of the grave, but "passed sentence against him and ordered his body to be dug up and burned." Was ever obloquy more deeply settled and persecution more inveterate?

In the Parliamentary proceedings of 1648, in which

the Presbyterians held predominant sway, and passed condemning to imprisonment without bail to death on conviction; those who held to and persisted in advocating the doctrine of Universalism, I think I have seen, and still see, the same spirit manifested in the present age; all it wants now is the parliamentary power, and the faggots would be kindled, the sword would be unsheathed, the gibbet would be erected, our *graves would be dug*, if perchance persecuting spirit would confer upon us so much grace as to let us have a grave in which we might quest. In many instances have the believers in this doctrine been denied the privileges of an oath in court of justice, in this land of boasted freedom and of rights, as though a man could not speak the truth unless he was frightened to do it by an omnipotent and angry God, and the crackling flames of an eternal hell. Surely, Mr. Stearns, we have "been hated and persecuted," and most diabolically treated "by women," and treated as the filth and offscourings of the earth. Paul was hated for teaching the doctrine of Universal Salvation. Hence he says, 1 Tim. 4:12, "For therefore we both labor and suffer reproach because we trust in the living God, who is the Savior of all men, specially of those that believe." This persecuting spirit has always found a home in the bosom of those who do not trust in God as "the Savior of men," as all past history of the Christian church

by those who persecuted and put the Founder of our religion to death?—who stoned Stephen?—who bound themselves under an oath to kill Paul?—who persecuted unto death the early christians?—who killed the Waldenses?—who slew such a multitude in France on St. Bartholomew's day?—who established the Inquisition?—who burned heretics and carried on all the persecutions in the christian church?—who drove the Puritans from their native home to the wilds of the American continent?—who imprisoned and killed alleged witches, and hung honest Quakers on our own soil?—who stoned Murray in Boston?—who continue to heap bitter persecution upon his followers by slandering their doctrine and holding them up to the ridicule of the world?—I answer in these emphatic words of truth: BELIEVERS IN THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS MISERY, OR, THOSE WHO DENY THAT "GOD IS THE SAVIOR OF ALL MEN." This is a startling truth, and one which can not be gainsayed. The history of the past has recorded it, and it stands out prominent there on its pages as a solemn warning and admonition to all future generations.

Again: my opponent says, "Some of the most bitter enemies of Christianity, as well as the most profligate characters in society, become their followers, not their persecutors." This is false. It insinuates that we fellowship and consider such with us in sentiment as are "bitter enemies of Christianity." This asser-

tion therefore comes only from a sectarian spirit of persecution.

Again, he inquires, "Did the Savior preach Universalism? Did his apostles? If they did, why did their preaching array the kingdoms of the earth against them?" I answer; because the kingdoms of the earth did not believe their doctrine, and hence they were filled with a persecuting spirit. They acted out the spirit of the doctrine which they professed.

What follows now in this pamphlet is mostly a caricature and burlesque upon the doctrine, with some remarks designing to show its immoral tendency. But as I design in my next Lecture to discourse upon the nature of the doctrine, its bearing upon our social relations, and its moral tendency; I shall pass over what few paragraphs there are remaining without comment.

I have now passed through with my examination of the arguments adduced in this remarkable pamphlet against the doctrine of God's boundless grace, and with my exposure of the many contradictions, misrepresentations and absurdities found therein. In my zeal and earnestness for the support of truth, I may have used some severity in my language; but I have the consciousness of having spoken in sincerity and love, and with the design of promoting the cause of my Redeemer. Let us all strive for unity of spirit in the bond of peace. Amen.

LECTURE XII.

In this lecture I purpose to trace out the history of the doctrine of Universal Salvation from the earliest ages down to the present time. We are accused of advocating a doctrine which has had but few believers, and those are among the illiterate and profligate. We are also charged with advocating a *new doctrine*, and yet it is allowed to be the oldest doctrine in existence, and the first that was preached on earth, namely, by satan in the garden of Eden when he said to the woman, "Ye shall not surely die." I have noticed this charge in a former lecture, and shown that it is false. Let the *advocates*, rather than the *enemies* of Universalism, inform the public where and when the doctrine originated, for they would be more likely to know, and full as apt to speak the truth. We disclaim to fellowship or advocate the doctrine which the serpent taught, and claim a higher origin and a more worthy first advocate of the doctrine of Universalism. Who then first taught this doctrine, and where did it originate?

All religious tenets have had some origin, or there was a time when they were first taught. Each christian sect has had its first founder or advocate who lived at some period subsequent to the apostolic age. We find that Methodism as a distinguished sentiment and as now taught, had its origin in the two Wesleys, in the year 1729. Calvinism had its origin in John Calvin, though

some of the more prominent features originated in the 4th century by Augustine, who taught the doctrine "of total depravity, irresistible grace, and sovereign, partial election."

I might point to other dates in which, and other persons in whom all the distinctive doctrines of this age, (except our own doctrine) originated. But we can not point to a period when ours was not taught. Nor can we point out or name the *man* who first originated or was the father of this doctrine, for it did not originate in man. But it *had* an origin, and had a *first advocate*. What then is its origin? and who first taught it? The question is very easily answered. And I rejoice that I am able to answer it from the record which God himself has made and preserved for my use. If it can be clearly shown that the Eternal Father has himself spoken this doctrine, we are bound under the most solemn obligation to receive it, and receive it as the truth. We claim him as the Author and first Teacher; and hence I shall not attempt to go back of this Origin to point out the antiquity of the doctrine. I shall here present his own language as given to us in his record. You will therefore, go back with me to the infancy of our race—to the period when there were but two created, sentient beings in all this wide world. These two, we are informed, transgressed. Prior to the transgression God said, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." This is Universalism, and one of

its most important truths—such as we have endeavored to preach faithfully as coming from God. And it is a fact worthy of the highest consideration that the *first moral* or doctrinal truth which was ever uttered on earth, or came down from God to man, is *this prominent truth of Universalism*, that the transgressor of God's law shall "surely die," not *uncertainly*, as the serpent taught and as many now teach, but "*surely*."

Again: not only do we find this heaven-taught doctrine of the adequate and certain punishment for transgression; but we also find, as the next heaven-sent truth, the doctrine of *Universal Salvation*, or the final destruction of sin. The language in which this doctrine is declared, and which was addressed to the serpent, is as follows: "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Here it is declared that there should be enmity or opposition between the offspring of the serpent and the child of the woman; and this opposition should effect simply the heel of the Son; whereas the opposition of the Son should effect the head of the serpent's offspring. This language denotes that the Seed of the woman [and this seed is Christ] is capable of overcoming the opposition which he has to encounter. The offspring of the serpent, or adversary, or enemy, has power simply to *bruise the heel*—a phrase which denotes that he has a *limited power*, one which does not reach the head and

the *heart*, and consequently is ineffectual, and will be subdued. But Christ, the Seed of the woman, had power to bruise the *head* of the enemy, that is, to destroy his very being. For this is the sense of the language as understood by John, who says, "The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil," 1 John 3: 8, and also by Paul who says, "That through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. 2: 14.

From this it appears that the language under consideration teaches the final triumph of Christ and the consequent overthrow of satan's empire.

Passing now from the period when this doctrine was first taught, we come to consider in the time of Abraham the next express declaration of the doctrine. God said to Abraham, that in his seed, which was Christ, all the nations and families of the earth should be blessed. Gen. 12: 18. That this blessing is spiritual and not temporal, is evident from the language of Peter in Acts, 3: 26. "Unto you first, God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, *in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.*" God not only promised this spiritual blessing to the Israelites, but foreseeing the justification or blessing of the Gentiles through the gospel, he included *them* also as the subjects of this blessing. Gal. 3: 8. This promise was repeated to Isaac and to Jacob. "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Gen. 26: 4; 28: 14.

Jacob, having a right view of this promise and the nature of the blessing, and seeing afar off the coming of the promised Seed, called together his sons to pronounce upon them his parting address, and said, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." Gen. 49: 10. He it is to whom shall be the gathering of the people, the same people before spoken of and included in the promise, namely, "all nations and families of the earth." Jacob was about to leave this world, and in his parting address he wished to impart comfort to his kindred by assuring them, that though he was about to leave them, and should see their face no more in the flesh; yet he should be gathered with all the families of the earth in Christ, the Shiloh, according to the promise, and enjoy their society where parting is unknown forever.

Again: as we descend in the chronology of events, we find Moses declaring, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." Deut. 18: 15.

The Israelites were represented as a stiff-necked and hard-hearted people, and dull of understanding. But Moses perceived that it would not always be so. They should hearken unto this Prophet, and we are told by this very Prophet that "those who hear shall live." I therefore look upon this declaration of Moses as a testi-

mony to the doctrine of Christ's universal triumph.—Philip said in reference to this Prophet, "We have found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." Others said, "This is of a truth that Prophet that should come into the world."

I shall now introduce the testimony of David, who wrote at a very early age of the world. In the second Psalm we read, "I will declare the decree: the Lord hath said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." Again: catching the spirit of the ancient promise made to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, he says, "All nations whom thou hast made shall come and worship before thee, O Lord; and shall glorify thy name. All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him." Ps. 86: 9; 22: 27; 72: 11.

Isaiah, the prophet of the Lord, spake of God's preparing a feast for all people—of his promise to destroy the covering cast over the face of all people, and the vail spread over all nations—to swallow up death in victory, and wipe away tears from off all faces. He also testifies what the spirit revealed to him, saying, "*I have sworn by myself; the word is gone out of my*

mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear; surely shall one say, *In the Lord have I righteousness and strength*: even to him shall men come, [as Moses had before told;] and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. In the Lord *shall all the seed of Israel be justified and shall glory.*" Again: speaking of God's Servant, he says, "The pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied. Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Isaiah 25: 6—8; 45: 23—25; 53: 10, 11; 1: 18.

I will now introduce the testimony of Jeremiah. He says that God would make a new covenant with the house of Israel, which is this, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Jer. 31: 33, 34. This language is clear and conclusive, that spiritual knowledge and forgiveness shall be universal, and that sin shall be swallowed up in forgetfulness.

Next; Daniel the prophet says of Christ the Messiah, "There was given him dominion, and glory, and

kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. And all dominions shall serve and obey him." Daniel 7: 14, 27.

Hosea next, speaking of the return and reconciliation of the Jews, says, "Afterwards shall the children of Israel return and seek the Lord their God, and David their king: and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the latter days. O death! I will be thy plagues; O grave! I will be thy destruction." Hos. 3:5; 13:14.

The prophet Joel adds his testimony. The Lord spake by him saying, "I will cleanse their blood that I have not cleansed: for the Lord dwelleth in Zion."— Joel 3: 21.

Amos and Obadiah have each in their prophetic sayings added their testimony, with the other prophets before them, for they all looked to the Christ that was promised to the patriarchs as the Redeemer of the world.

Micah speaks of the flourishing of Christ's kingdom, and refers us to the time when such as rebel against the kingdom of Christ shall be subdued, and their implements of war shall be fashioned into implements of husbandry; nation shall cease to war with nation, and the art of war shall be taught no more. Micah 4: 2, 3.

Zephaniah records the language indited by the Lord, *"I will turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him*

with one consent. The Lord thy God in the midst of thee is mighty ; he will save, he will rejoice over thee with joy ; *he will rest in his love.*" Zeph. 3: 9, 17.

Haggai the prophet, refers to the introduction of the gospel kingdom, when God by his word should shake all nations, and the Desire of all nations should come, and he should fill the latter covenant with glory greater than the glory of the former, and in it he should give peace. Hag. 2: 7—9.

Malachi, the last of the prophets, speaks of "The Sun of Righteousness," who should "arise with *healing* in his wings"—and "sit as a *refiner and purifier.*" Mal. 3: 2, 3 ; 4: 2.

Thus I close my examination of the testimony which has been recorded in the Old Testament writings. I have not by any means quoted all that might be gathered from this ancient record, as pointing to the days of Christ, and the accomplishment of the great work of reconciling all things to himself. I have referred you to the express and repeated declarations of the Lord himself in the infancy of the world—to Moses in a later period, and to eleven other inspired prophets of the Most High.

If then it be a truth that the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men be taught in the Old Testament, we have good reason to believe that the writers of the New, believed the same doctrine. *Indeed, we hear Peter in Acts, 3: 21, saying of Christ,*

"Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things, which God hath spoken *by the mouth of all his holy prophets* since the world began." And Paul says, Acts 24: 14, "So worship I the God of my fathers, *believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets.*" Accordingly, he did not reject their testimony. With the other apostles, he quoted largely from Moses and the prophets.

I will now invite your attention to the testimony found in the writings of the New Testament. Matthew has recorded many sayings of Christ. And in the parables we find much to convince us of the restoration of all things, particularly in the parables of "the leaven," of "the mustard seed," of "the lost piece of silver," of "the lost sheep," and of "the prodigal son," &c. These were all spoken to illustrate the nature and extent of Christ's kingdom, and the character of God's dealings with his creatures. Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, all record the same general facts. Luke has written more than the rest concerning Christ's nativity. He says that the news of his birth would be tidings of great joy unto all people, for a SAVIOR was born; "the *Desire* of all nations," as the prophet foretold, had come. Simeon declared, "Mine eyes have seen thy salvation, which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel." Luke 2: 10, 11, 30, 31, 32.

Matthew has recorded the instructions of Christ con-

cerning the universality of God's love, as in chapter 5: verses 44, 45. Both Matthew and Luke have spoken of the state of men in the resurrection, and represent them as being "equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being children of the resurrection." Mat. 22: 30; Mark 12: 25; Luke 20: 36.

Christ, by the Evangelist John, said, "I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. As thou hast given him power over all flesh that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.— And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent. All that the Father giveth me, shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out. For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of of Him that sent me. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." And in his last prayer he says, "Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory," &c. John 12: 3; 19: 2; 3: 6; 37: 39; 17: 24:

We will now hear the venerable apostle Paul. To the Romans he says, "Blindness in part is happened to Israel, until"—how long? not to all eternity, but—"until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written." Here the apo-

He quotes from the prophet. "There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob. If the casting away of them be the *reconciling of the world*, what shall the receiving of them be but life from the dead? As by the offense of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Moreover he declares that grace shall superabound sin.—Rom. 11: 15, 25, 26; 5: 18—21.

To the Corinthians he says, Christ must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, and the last enemy shall be destroyed. All thing shall be subdued unto him. 1 Cor. 15: 25—28.

To the Galatians he quotes the universal promise made to Abraham, showing that the law could not annul the promise, and that Christ was the promised seed in whom the promise should be fulfilled. Gal. 3: 8, 16—21.

To the Ephesians he says, "God hath abounded toward us in all wisdom and prudence; having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven and which are on earth." Eph. 1: 7—10.

To the Philippians he says, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name ; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Phil. 2: 9—11.

To the Colosians he says, "It pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell ; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to *reconcile all things to himself* ; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Col. 1 : 19, 20. In his letters to the Thessalonians he has not written much of doctrine ; they are filled principally with exhortations, advice, and words of encouragement and consolation.

To Timothy he says, "I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men ; for kings, and for all that are in authority ; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. 2 : 1—6.

To Titus he says, "For the grace of God that

bringeth salvation to all men hath appeared. Jesus Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity," &c. Ti. 2: 11, 14.

To the Hebrews he says, "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." He quotes the language of Jeremiah concerning the covenant before noticed; and also refers to the promise given to Abraham, that it was "confirmed by an oath," that those who believe it might have unshaken hope and "strong consolation." Again; "We see Jesus who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man. Lo I come to do thy will, O God; by the which will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all." This is the repeated testimony of Paul, that Christ gave himself a sacrifice for all, and after giving this "one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down on the right hand of God, from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool." Heb. 2: 8, 9, 14, 15; 6: 13—20; 10: 9—13.

Peter's testimony I have already given. He speaks "of the times of the restitution of all things." And also says, "Unto you first, God, having raised up his

Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Acts 3: 21, 26.

I have also presented John's testimony in his gospel, and will now quote from his epistles. "Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins. And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the *Savior of the world*. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might *destroy the works of the devil*. And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for our's only, but also for the sins of the *whole world*." 1 John 2: 2; 3: 5, 8; 4: 10, 14; 5: 10, 11.

Passing from his epistles, we turn to his Revelations. He had said in his gospel, "Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world;" and now in view of him and his ultimate triumph he might say with the "Ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of angels, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing."—For "Every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, he heard saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." and why should they not thus exult, since the time had come which John foresaw, when tears should be wiped from all eyes, and there should "be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither any more pain."—5: 11—13; 21: 4

It was given to John to furnish the last of the New Testament writings; and he pens the last words in this animating benediction—“*The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you ALL—AMEN.*”

My next labor will be to trace out the doctrine of Universal Salvation from the time of John, through all the subsequent periods down to the present time. There are a few writings extant, written about the time of John's demise, A. D. 96, and from those few we can find nothing that is clearly expressive of the doctrine of Universalism or of its opposite. The epistle of Polycarp however, contains something worthy of notice in this place. Polycarp was supposed to be the pupil of St. John, and received his doctrine from him. He was considered a very eminent christian, and was Bishop of Smyrna from about the time of John's death, to the middle of the following century, a period of about fifty years. In his epistle he says, “To whom (Christ) all things are made subject, both that are in heaven and that are in earth: whom every living creature shall worship.”

Among all the writings that appeared after the death of John to the year of our Lord 131, we do not find the word *eternal* or *everlasting* applied to punishment.

About A. D. 120, the Basilidians and Carpocratians arose, and though they were Gnostic christians, yet they maintained some important truths. Basilides was

an Egyptian philosopher, the founder of the Basilidians, and taught that God is infinitely good, and that the grand object of the divine punishment is reformation. Carpocratis, the founder of the sect Carpocratians, maintained the same sentiment, and made it a prominent article of faith, that God was impartially good and benignant, and that in all his dealings with his creatures, he designs their ultimate improvement.

Passing over a period now of about 70 years, in which no express declaration of the doctrine is found; I come to A. D. 190, when that very learned and distinguished christian father flourished, Clemens Alexandrinus. I will quote a few passages clearly expressive of his Universalism. Says he, "It is the office of salutary justice, continually to exalt everything towards the best state of which it is capable." Again: "There is nothing which the Lord hates, for he cannot hate anything and yet will that it shall exist. Now whoever loves another, wishes to benefit him, and therefore God does good unto all. The chastisements of God are salutary and instructive, leading to amendment, and preferring the repentance to the death of the sinner. Speaking of Christ, he says, "How is he a Savior and Lord, unless he is the Savior and Lord of all? He is certainly the Savior of those who have believed; and of those who have not believed, he is the Lord, until by being brought to confess him, they shall receive the proper and well adapted blessing for themselves. The

Lord is the propitiation, not only for our sins, that is of the faithful, but also for the whole world—therefore he indeed saves all” Clemens advocated this doctrine with great boldness and ability, and was not censured for so doing by any of his cotemporaries. He lived but about 90 years after the death of John, and seems to have preserved the sentiment which was taught by that eminent apostle. Indeed, his tenet of Universal Salvation seems to have been the Orthodoxy of his age.

We come down now to A. D. 230, when Origen began to show himself in the church as a man of strong and vigorous mind, and was therefore afterwards called Adamantius. He also was an advocate of Universal Salvation—was a pupil of Clemens Alexandrinus, and the author of many thousand volumes. “As a moral and religious man his character is consistent, and his reputation without a blot; both his friends and his enemies agree in attributing to him the most illustrious virtue, ardent piety and the purest zeal.” Moseheim says he was “a man of vast and uncommon abilities, and the greatest luminary of the christian world, which this age exhibited to view. His virtues and his labors deserve the admiration of all ages, and his name will be transmitted with honor through the annals of time as long as learning and genius shall be esteemed among men.”

We rejoice, therefore, that we can rank such men among the early and public advocates of the doctrine.

His fame as a scholar, as a writer and as a theologian was almost universal; and men seeking instruction flocked to him from almost all parts of the world, that they might be benefited by his personal labors.

Your attention is now invited to a few quotations from this venerable prelate, in which he sets forth the doctrine of the final purity of our race. He says, "We suppose that the goodness of God, through Christ, will certainly restore all creatures into one final state; his very enemies being overcome and subdued. For thus saith the scriptures: 'The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' Psl. 110: 1. To the same purport, but more clearly, the apostle Paul says that Christ 'must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' But if there be any doubt what is meant by '*putting enemies under his feet*,' let us hear the apostle still further, who says 'for all things must be subjected to him.'"

I might quote much more, but the passages already quoted show clearly enough his doctrinal views. He was not however without opposers and even bitter persecutors. A few ambitious and selfish aspirants who envied his fame and were unwilling to bow to a superior, waged a terrible war against him, so that even his life was put in jeopardy. But it was not on account of his Universalism—that escaped their condemnation till a later period.

The next most distinguished personage of this period

was Ambrosius, a convert of Origen. He assisted Origen in the issuing of several works in which Universalism was argued at length, and therefore he may be reckoned among the believers and patrons of that doctrine.

Gregory Thaumaturgus also, who was ordained to the work of the ministry about A. D. 140, was a pupil of Origen, and an advocate of his doctrines. He was successful in his labors; and such was the great increase of converts that it was necessary to erect a temple for christian worship: the *first* of the kind it is said of which history gives any account. We trust then that there was a religious revival, and a revival on truly rational and christian principles—that the doctrines of Gregory inclined men to be devotional and to assemble together for *public worship*. This should serve as a praise-worthy example to all of Origen's followers to the present day:

We come now to the period between the years 254 and 390, and strange as it may seem, during the long period of 150 years, Origen's Universalism was not a subject of complaint in the church. It is said his writings were subjected to "the severest scrutiny," and while other points of his faith were attacked, this remained without censure or opposition; even when Methodius, Origen's opponent, selected seven or eight particulars from his works and wrote against them; and when about A. D. 307 there were nine particulars selected from his doctrines and condemned, this par-

ticular tenet was passed over without a censure. And here it is worthy of remark that Eusebius, the earliest ecclesiastical historian, who wrote an apology for Origen against his numerous opponents, and was very familiar with his writings, did not even suspect that he was charged by any with heresy for his *Universalism*, nor did he or his familiar friend Pamphilus oppose that tenet. From all this it appears evident, that throughout all this period it was not regarded by the church as heretical.

Titus, Bishop of Bostra, was also a believer in the doctrine at this period. Basil, Bishop of Nyssa, and his friend Gregory Nazianzen also. To these might be added Gregory Nyssen, Didymus, and Jerome, as orthodox fathers of the Greek or eastern church; these all unequivocally assert their belief in the doctrine.—At a later period, A. D. 390, we find Evagrius Ponticus who was a believer.

John, Bishop of Jerusalem, who was born about A. D. 356, was a Universalist. He was shamefully persecuted by that hot-headed, enthusiastic, selfish and bigoted Epiphanius, who in his personal animosity to John for being a patron of Origen, drew up, A. D. 394, a long catalogue of charges, (some of which were true and some were false) that he might create a public prejudice against him. And in this list of charges is contained the *first censure* in all the records of antiquity against the particular tenet of Universal Salvation.

or rather, more correctly, the censure is aimed at Origen's doctrine concerning the salvation of the devil.

From this time contentions between the Origenists, as they were now termed, and the opposite party, grew more violent, till at length Epiphanius calling over to his aid several influential men, succeeded, in an ecclesiastical council at Alexandria, A. D. 399, in procuring a condemnation of Origen and all who favored his works. This was the first ecclesiastical council assembled for this purpose. Theophilus, at the head of a band of soldiers, marched against the Origenists, who fled into Palestine after much suffering. But it is due to observe here, lest some shall misunderstand, that neither in the decree of the Roman Pontiff which condemned the works of Origen, nor in that of the council of Alexandria or Cyprus, is Origen's doctrine of *the salvation of ALL MEN* condemned, for "some of the orthodox continued to ~~avow it in the church with~~ impunity." Augustine admits this, for he represents that the censure of the church, aimed at Origen's notions concerning "the salvation of the *devil and his angels*." But Origen's doctrine of the salvation of *all mankind* was reserved for ecclesiastical condemnation at a little later period.

About A. D. 410, one Avitus, a native of Spain, returning from the east, brought with him Origen's celebrated *Book of Principles*, and the doctrines contained therein he imbibed and taught.

The next most remarkable orthodox bishop who taught the doctrine of universal happiness, and who lived about A. D. 420, was Theodorus, bishop of Mopsuestia.

In A. D. 430 Universalism prevails in Palestine, and particularly in Cesarea, where the apostles had long before publicly declared the same sentiment. But from this period to the end of this century, very few traces of the doctrine are to be found. The reason is not, we apprehend, because it was not believed, but because of the general persecutions which were every where waged against its believers. This tended for a season to keep it in comparative silence. But after a lapse of sixty or seventy years it began to spread again extensively in Palestine, which served to provoke a new attack by the combined ecclesiastical power. Accordingly after many councils had been called to suppress the rising heresy—and after anathematizing and banishing many of its believers, a council of 165 bishops was convoked at Constantinople in A. D. 553, when by this human (or inhuman) authority, and not by scriptural authority or reason, it was finally condemned. This decree, which was unalterable, and which was signed by the cruel and weak minded Justinian, went forth as a law of the kingdom, fixing the doom of Origen's doctrine and establishing the opposite doctrines as the Orthodoxy of the age.

In A. D. 649, or 96 years after this, the anathema was repeated by the first Lateran Council convened at

Rome, against Origen, and against his followers, Didymus and Evagrius. From about this time, or a little later, succeeds a period of almost midnight darkness, until about the time of the Reformation, when the freedom of speech was again more fully enjoyed—the chains of Popery were being thrown off, and the art of printing was discovered. It was then that the doctrine revived again, and spread itself over all the countries of Europe. Previous to this event, however, it may be due to remark, that in A. D. 1190, among the monks of France, Universalism prevailed, and the Abbot Rainold was censured for maintaining the doctrine.

In A. D. 1315 the doctrine was held by the Lollards in Germany. It prevailed in Bohemia and Austria; and there were about this time, it is said, “twenty-four thousand persons in Germany who held” the doctrine.

In A. D. 1368 it was taught in England, but was condemned by a council assembled at Canterbury. In A. D. 1400 there was a class of men in Holland called “*Men of Understanding*,” who were Universalists.

In A. D. 1480 John Picus, an Italian, denied the infinite demerit of sin. Hence he says, “Infinite pain is not due even to mortal sin; because sin is finite, and therefore merits but finite punishment.”

We have now come down to near the period of the Reformation, which commenced its date under Martin Luther, in A. D. 1517. At this period, when the Roman hierarchy began visibly to lose its control of the

public mind, the doctrine found many defenders, who were willing to brave the storm of persecution for truth's sake, both in Germany and in England. In the succeeding century it was zealously promulgated from the pulpit and the press. Afterwards it found its way not only into the countries named, but also into most of the kingdoms of Europe. The doctrine now prevails in Germany, and to such an extent too, that certain self-styled Evangelicals of our country have become alarmed. Mr. Dwight, who traveled quite extensively in Germany, and who published an account of his travels in A. D. 1829, says, "The doctrine of the eternity of future punishment is almost universally rejected. I have seen but *one* person in Germany who believed it, and but one other whose mind was wavering on this subject." And Professor Sears, now of the Baptist Theological School at Newton, Mass., says, "The great majority of evangelical divines" hold the doctrine of Universal Salvation. And what is not a little important, is the fact, that travelers and historians all admit that Germany is nearly 100 years in advance of every other nation in biblical knowledge and criticism. Her subjects are all thoroughly taught. It is emphatically a learned nation. And in reference to the influence of learning, Doederlein, a German writer, says, "The more distinguished by learning any one in christian antiquity was, so much the more did he foster and defend the hope of a final termination of torments."

This is true, as all past history of the christian church shows. For wherever learning has been tolerated most, and free discussion has not been proscribed, *there* has Universalism prevailed the most extensively, as facts in *this* country particularly, show.

In A. D. 1760 Universalists became a distinct sect in England, under the ministry of James Rely. And though the believers in the doctrine had formerly been condemned by an act of Parliament, A. D. 1648, yet the doctrine was not always to remain in obscurity. It had numerous and learned advocates in the Established Church—is now believed there by many, if not the body of the Unitarians.

In the United States, as early as A. D. 1755, a work was published in Germantown, Pa. by Paul Siegvolk, in defense of Universalism, and where as early as 1741 the doctrine was publicly preached by George De Benneville. After him were Rev. Richard Clark, who preached in Charleston, S. C., and Dr. Mayhew, who preached in Boston, A. D. 1747.

The next most distinguished preacher of the doctrine in America was the Rev. John Murray, who came from England and preached in New Jersey, A. D. 1770. Winchester, Dr. Chauncey and many others, whose names I need not here mention, who were also its public advocates, and whose examples of piety and devotion will command the respect and admiration of the *christian world*.

And notwithstanding the repeated denunciations which have been poured out in wrath upon the doctrine age after age—having been many times condemned both by church and state, and many of its believers put to death or banished—it still lives. It may be truly said to have “come up out of great tribulation.” God has been its protector. It now continues, like the sturdy oak that has received the blasts of many storms, to flourish, despite the opposition that is raised against it. It flourishes not only in our own happy land, but also in the British Provinces, in England, on the Continent of Europe and “the far-off isles,” under the fostering care of a benignant Providence, who hath said, “I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.”

We now rank in point of numbers and moral influence, probably the *fourth* denomination in the United States; having, according to the statistics in the Register for 1848, including the British Provinces, one General Convention; 19 State and Provincial Conventions; 81 Associations; 1116 Societies; 716 meeting-houses, and 717 preachers.”

Thus I finish what I have to say with regard to the origin and history of the doctrine of Universal Salvation. I have given but a brief history, it is true, but it is as full as my limits would allow. The authorities to which I have referred are, 1st, The writings of the Old and New Testaments; 2d, Eusebius, the renowned father of ecclesiastical history—Lardner—Cuvier—

Fleury—Newton—Gibbon—Cave—Milman—Mosheim, and the authors of the Ancient and Modern Histories of Universalism, to whom I am more particularly indebted for the order of the dates.

LECTURE XIII.

An apostle once said before his accusers, "Men, brethren, and fathers, hear ye my defense, which I make now unto you." Acts 22 : 1. It was no uncommon thing for the early christians to have their characters assailed, their motives impeached, and their doctrine misrepresented. That was an evil which they endured long and patiently, and which has not yet ceased among men. *We* have borne the same evil, but whether we have borne it with the same patience, the Searcher of all hearts alone can tell. In the midst of all the scoffs, and jeers, and persecutions for opinion's sake, it is gratifying to us to know that we have the privilege of speaking in our own "defense," when our doctrine is censured and misrepresented. The time has now come, since the prejudices of the public mind have been greatly weakened and there is a stronger inclination for each one to investigate for himself, when men will hear our defense, and inquire earnestly *to know what is Universalism?* I shall now endeavor

to answer the inquiry and defend the doctrine from the foul aspersions which have been heaped upon it. I shall not speak in reference to the abstract question of universal holiness and happiness only, but shall present every important particular composing the whole body of the doctrine now taught by Universalists.

1. We believe in one God, and no more, "for though there be gods many and lords many, yet to *us* there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ," "the Mediator between God and men, the Son of God and Savior of the world;" that "he is that Prophet that should come into the world, of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write." These are the first principles or fundamentals of our faith—the first in order and the first in importance. Hence we are neither Deists, nor Atheists, nor contemners of the sacred writings, as it has been slanderously reported of us.

2. Since we believe in Jesus Christ who made a sacrifice for sin, we accordingly believe in the ATONEMENT, as taught in the scriptures. And it is one of the strangest things in the world that we should be charged with *denying* the atonement, since the doctrine of universal deliverance from sin and the reconciliation of all men to God, clearly and unequivocally asserts the doctrine. We simply deny the common views of atonement, and not the atonement itself as we understand the scripture account of it. We deny that Christ

"died to reconcile the Father to us"—that he gave himself a sacrifice to appease an incensed Deity, or came to

"Quench the Father's flaming sword,
In his own vital blood."

We have no such doctrine to vindicate against the appeals of reason, and scripture, and truth, and common sense.

The plain and literal sense of the term *atonement*, is *agreement, reconciliation*. And since God is unchangeable, and man is unreconciled, the atonement in this sense has reference to a change in man only. And we believe that reconciliation of man to his Maker will be universal, through or by Christ. We however, more explicitly, use the term *atonement* in reference to that divine "process by which mankind are *reconciled* to God, to each other, and to themselves," and not abstractly in reference to Christ's dying upon the cross. Hence we say with the great majority of christians, that "Christ made a universal atonement," or, adopted a process by which universal salvation may be effected, and not only may, but will. In proof of this, we rely upon the testimony of Paul, who says, "God hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself. If one died for all, then were all dead," that is morally dead, and in such a state needed reconciliation;

therefore "he died for all, that they which live, should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again." Farther ; "There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for *all*." Again, "He tasted death for *every man*." Here is the testimony of one apostle, and testimony enough, one would suppose, to convince any reasonable mind that the reconciliation of all the unreconciled or morally dead, was the great end and crowning object of his mission.

Hence, you perceive that we believe in the *scripture* doctrine of atonement, or, as some would pronounce it, at-one-ment, meaning at one mind, which is expressed in the word reconciliation. When man is reconciled to God, he is of one mind with him. Both have one object, one purpose, one disposition. In view of this oneness (or reconciliation) Christ prayed that those who believed in him might "all be one : as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us." Here we have the doctrine of atonement, agreement, or reconciliation, as we believe it, clearly set forth. We see that God was in or through Christ reconciling the world to himself, or engaged in the work of universal reconciliation—that Christ came to finish this work and even prayed to his Father for it. Must we then be charged with denying the atonement? Must we be scoffed at and despised because we have sufficient confidence in Christ's union with the Father,

in spirit and object, to believe his prayer was right, and being right, will be answered ? Let such as scoff and despise us, remember Christ's words, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matt. 25 : 40.

We believe that this atonement or reconciliation which Christ was to effect, may be experienced in this life, in part at least, and which was designed to be effected here by Christ's coming and by his establishing his system of divine truth among men. Man was in an unreconciled state—at enmity with God—alienated from him by wicked works. And now, to bring him back, to make him of one mind, and enable him to feel a unity with the divine Spirit, and hold sweet communion with his Maker, Christ has revealed his Father—unfolded the beauty, the loveliness, and the parental excellency of his character. And to seal the truth of his divine mission—to convince man, sinful man, that God loved him, he died upon the cross, "the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God." In all his labors and instructions, his object was to so set before man those heavenly truths concerning God's character and purposes, that they might melt down the stubborn heart, make it feel the impress of the Divinity that sanctifies, and turn it unto God in true holiness. Moreover he labored to bring sinful man to realize how great was that goodness against which he sinned—how *exalted*, constant and impartial that loving kindness

which he disregarded, and how manifold the blessings which he abused ; yea, also, to show him how wretched and miserable he made himself by living away from God, and how many comforts he thereby shut out from his heart which he might enjoy. This was the way in which he labored to produce present reconciliation.— This is the way in which man was brought to experience a *special salvation*. And that system of atonement which Christ established, reveals a salvation also which is of free grace, or perfect reconciliation from which there is no relapse—to be enjoyed hereafter, “when that state which is perfect is come.” This salvation may be enjoyed here by faith, in *addition* to the present or special salvation ; so that man has by this system the best of motives, reasons, inducements and encouragements constantly set before him, making their most powerful appeal and kind entreaty to be reconciled to God and enjoy his salvation. Therefore,

3. We believe most firmly in the necessity of reformation, the new birth, regeneration, or whatever that may be termed which fits man for the enjoyment of Christ’s spiritual kingdom here—prepares him for all his various duties, and smooths the bed of death with hope that leans upon immortality. In support of this doctrine we quote the language of John: “Beloved, let us love one another, for love is of God ; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. And this love, that we walk after his commandments.”

Mark this. John tells us what he means by loving God and thus being born of God—it is to “*walk after his commandments.*” And says he, “This is his commandment, that *we should believe on the name of his son Jesus Christ*, and love one another, as he gave us commandment. And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him, and he in him.”

From this you will perceive that we believe in no *miraculous* change; that we are not required to perform *miracles* in order to experience the new birth—the work is such as we can comprehend and perform. There is nothing miraculous or beyond our powers of comprehension in loving God, keeping his commandments, and believing in his Son, Jesus Christ. The duty is a plain, reasonable, and desirable one. And had it been enjoined upon man in this light, stripped of all mystery and gloom, thousands would have been found walking in the ways of the Lord, who from a mistaken view of its nature have dreaded it and put off attending to it till old age or death has overtaken them. There is every thing pleasing and delightful in this duty, and no abridgment of happiness consequent upon obeying it. Its reward is, “God dwelling in us and we in him,” being of one mind and one spirit, which is reconciliation with God, or enjoying the atonement. “I pray ye, therefore,” says Paul, “be ye reconciled to God.” Practice this most righteous and reasonable duty of loving God and keeping his commandments—do good unto all,

that ye may be imitators of God—love as brethren, for he that loveth *God*, will love his *brother also*;—be kind and affectionate one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you, knowing that love is the great crowning excellency—the central sun of the moral world, whence irradiates all light, and life, and joy. If this love be in you and abide, ye are born of God.

What means, therefore, should be used to produce this new birth? We would adopt the same method of instruction employed by Christ and his apostles—address the understanding—inform the judgment—persuade—entreat with all long suffering and kindness—draw aside the veil which has hung over the mind, and let the goodness of God and all the revealed beauties and parental loveliness of his character shine in upon the heart, till we see the penitential tear fall, and hear coming up from the soul this apostolic exclamation,—“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us!”

4. From the foregoing remarks it will be perceived that we believe in the necessity of *repentance*. By this term we understand a christian reform—a turning from the practice of all evil to the practice of all goodness. In other words, it consists in godly sorrow for sin and a sincere desire to forsake the paths of wickedness and live as God requires.

5. We believe in the doctrine of *forgiveness*, not the

forgiveness of *deserved punishment*, but the forgiveness of *sins*. Hence we read, "Bless the Lord, who *forgiveth* all thine *iniquities*." And again, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Savior, for to give *repentance* to Israel, and *forgiveness of sins*." Forgiveness is no where in scripture applied to punishment, but is always applied to sins.—Forgiveness is a quality of the Divine nature, evincing the kindest care which the God of love has for his sinful and erring children. He is disposed to "*take away our sins*," and not to keep us under the dominion of them eternally. Forgiveness is as much a part of his nature as the attribute goodness; and hence Christ, while upon the cross, prays to him for the forgiveness of his enemies—those who were morally dead and polluted with sin. In the language of Daniel we say, "To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgiveness, though we have rebelled against him."

6. We believe in adequate rewards and punishments as well as in the forgiveness of sins. And the forgiveness of sins does not conflict with the just punishment for sins. They both agree in the same object—the remission or sending out of sin and the cleansing of the heart. Therefore, when a man has received adequate punishment, (and no punishment can be adequate that does not result in good,) forgiveness will necessarily follow. Hence, a man can be both adequately punished, and forgiven. Now we most firmly believe on

scripture authority that every transgressor shall be adequately punished for all his sins; and for every good deed he shall be amply rewarded. And furthermore, as no one can merit future eternal happiness by his good deeds; so neither can he demerit eternal unhappiness by his evil deeds. This position can never be refuted. All christians admit that no one deserves the eternal bliss of heaven for his good deeds here: and by precisely the same mode of reasoning we contend that no man can deserve to be made endlessly wretched by his evil acts. If the first proposition be true, as all christians admit, then the last is true also. Hence you will perceive that we adopt the same mode of reasoning to prove the limited nature of punishment, that others do to prove man's incapacity to earn the bliss of heaven. If their argument has any weight or truth in it, ours has just as much.

From these remarks you will learn that we believe man can be punished adequately and fully for all his sins, and punished *according* to his *deserts*, without being punished endlessly. And not only do we prove this from the mode of reasoning just adopted, but also from the fact that if punishment be *not limited*, no sinner can receive his deserts. It is an utter impossibility. Can a man receive that which is endless in duration? It is the greatest paradox in existence. As well might we talk about exhausting that which is inexhaustible, and changing that which is unchangeable, or perform-

ing any other impossibility. My bible informs me of no other punishment than such as *can be received*. I know of no other punishment ever threatened to man. *There is no other, there can be no other*. The idea of *endless*, then, refutes itself, when applied to man's receiving his deserts. It precludes the possibility of the scripture doctrine being true, which teaches that man "*shall receive* for the wrong that he hath done;" not shall be endlessly *receiving*, for no such doctrine is taught in that sacred book, but shall *receive*. This clearly implies that there is a definite measure which can be received, and received in full. These are some of the reasons why I oppose the term *endless*, being applied to punishment.

Besides, we are taught that man shall not only *receive*, but receive *according* to his deeds. This doctrine is set forth on almost every page of the divine writings. Now as man is limited in his capacity, and limited in his deeds; so also must his punishment be, to be in accordance with his deeds. And in agreement with this view is Paul's language to the Hebrews, where we read of an "*afterward*" to the divine punishment, and of "*fruit*" being produced by it, namely, "*righteousness*." While therefore I have the light of reason and scripture to guide me, I cannot, I dare not teach that my heavenly Father will punish his children endlessly, without *even designing* to produce "the peaceable fruit of *righteousness*." The thought is blasphemous; to speak

it is pernicious. Rather let me say in the language of the inspired apostle, that "He chasteneth us for our *profit*, that we might be partakers of his holiness." Hence you will perceive that we have reason and scripture in support of our views of punishment.

We also believe that punishment is *certain*, as well as limited, and will surely follow every transgressor. For God "will by no means clear the guilty." The soul that sinneth shall die." "Tribulation and anguish shall be upon every soul of man that doeth evil." And we not only believe in the certainty of punishment for evil deeds, but also in the certainty of *rewards* for well doing. David said, "In keeping the commandments there is great reward. Great peace have they that love thy law." When man does right he is blessed "*in his deed*," "he shall not lose his reward."

7. We believe the scriptures speak of a state of holiness and bliss immortal—that man shall rise from the present state of mortality and death, to one of immortality and endless life—from corruption to incorruption—from dishonor to glory—and that we all shall, in the most exalted spiritual sense, become the children of God being the children of the resurrection—equal unto the angels, and can die no more—death, the last enemy, being destroyed, and life, uncorrupted, universal and complete, forever reigns. Hence,

8. We believe in the universal holiness and happiness of all God's intelligent offspring—a salvation from

sin and from sin-producing causes, and not a salvation in sin, or a translation of all sinners great and small in their sins into the state of the blessed, "as we be slanderously reported and as some men affirm that we" believe. We believe that all (for all have sinned,) shall be perfectly cleansed by the purifying influence of God's grace, before they can enter heaven. For no unclean thing can enter there: and "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," that is, enjoy him. Holiness is indispensable to happiness and the enjoyment of God. And the same grace which fitted "the chief of sinners" for that blessed abode, will also fit others less sinful for the same state. And for proof of this position, we rely upon scripture testimony, which is abundant. Paul speaks of Christ as one that should "destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the *devil*." And John says, "the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the *works* of the devil." Now if the devil and all his works are destroyed—if all the misery and evil effects he has occasioned in the world shall be utterly extirminated, so that there is no longer an enemy to tempt, or any of his acts to afflict man—what must follow but universal purity and happiness?

In view of these plain passages of scripture, so perfectly descriptive of the great purposes of the Messiah's advent, I dare not say that an enemy will continue to torment, and blast the happiness of man eternally, or that Christ will suffer a defeat in not accomplishing the

"*purpose*" for which "he was manifested." No: I dare not, for as Paul says, "Woe is unto me if I preach *not the GOSPEL*." I must suffer woe upon woe to believe that Christ will be defeated in his purpose, and that the enemy of God and man will continue to corrupt and torment a large portion of mankind interminably, for it is a woful doctrine, "our enemies themselves being judges."

The doctrine I am now defending is in harmony with, 1st, God's promise. God gave promise to Abraham that in his seed, which was Christ, all the nations and families of the earth shall be blessed. Gen. 12: 18; Gal. 3: 8, 16. And Paul says, "He is faithful that promised." We also read in Num. 23: 19, "God is not a man, that he should lie; neither the son of man, that he should repent: hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?" 2d: God *will*s the salvation of all. "Who will have all men to be saved and come unto the knowledge of the truth. And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing." How many did the Father give him? "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given *all things* into his hand. He hath given him power over all flesh." And Christ shows that he approves of, and has full confidence in that will. For he says, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to *finish* his work." Hence, a work to be *finished* and none

other was given him. And it is declared to be *God's* work. And *his* work is, as Paul says, "The reconciling of *the world to himself*." This was God's will and work; and no other work could Christ say it was his meat to do, than such as shall be *finished*. 3d. God has *purposed* the salvation of all. "Having made known unto us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he hath purposed in himself; that in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things in Christ." 4th. This is agreeable with the *pleasure* of the Lord. John says, "Thou hast created all things: and for thy *pleasure* they are and were created." And Paul says, "It pleased the Father that in him [Christ] should all *fullness* dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself." Col. 1: 19, 20. This was *pleasing* to the Father, namely, *the reconciliation of all things*. 5th. The doctrine is supported by the *oath* of God. "I have sworn by myself, the word has gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that unto me every knee shall bow," &c. Isa. 45: 23, 24. And Paul adds, "Every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to *the glory of God the Father*." Phil. 2: 10, 11. Again: "When God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself. God, willing more *abundantly* to show unto the heirs of promise the im-

mutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an *oath*," &c. Heb. 6: 13, 17.

Not only have we the promise, will, purpose, pleasure and oath of God, but other scripture passages clearly expressive of them, in support of our view. We find expressions like these, that Christ "gave himself a ransom for all—that he is a propitiation for the sins of the whole world—that he was manifested to take away our sins—Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world—We have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the *Savior of the world*—I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me—All things shall be subdued unto him," &c. The scripture evidence is almost inexhaustible. I need not therefore quote more in this place.

What then shall we say in view of this overwhelming amount of testimony? Shall we say that Universalism has no foundation in reason or scripture?—that it is entirely destitute of truth, utterly false, and "the device of satan"? With such a weight of scripture evidence in its support, surely it is worthy of some respect, and entitled to some consideration. What mean these passages, and a thousand others of the same import, or have they no meaning? Verily, I do not deem it my duty to discard them to avoid embracing the doctrine which they support, fearing that as a consequence of embracing it I should meet with the reproaches of a

scoffing and bigoted generation! I had rather have this doctrine, with so much of God's word in its defense, than every thing else without it. "For if God be for us, who can be against us?" Surely none successfully. God's word is sure and will stand, though all things else should fail. And hence we say in the hope-inspiring language of the trusting psalmist, "Forever, O Lord, thy word is settled in heaven."

If God the Eernal Father has *promised*, *willed*, and *purposed* a thing, can we not have confidence enough in him to believe that he will do it? If it is his *pleasure* that the fullness of our race shall dwell in his Son, shall we say his pleasure never shall be gratified? If God by an *oath* has confirmed the truth of his promise to bless all nations, can we not believe him under oath? O! of all unbelief, this is the most obstinate. Let me not, then, be obnoxious to the charge made by our Savior at a certain time when he said, "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken!" And God, by the month of all his holy prophets, has spoken of the times of the restitution of all things.

9. Having now presented some of the more prominent theoretical features of this doctrine, and some of its proofs, I shall in the next place invite attention to the claims which this doctrine has upon the support, approbation, and confidence of the world; *First*, on *account of its moral tendency*. I know it is a common

saying that this doctrine is very licentious. But if it is so, then the charge of licentiousness lays with equal force against those scriptures in whose language this doctrine is expressed. But what makes it licentious? Is it because it presents before men too much *goodness* in God? It certainly cannot be because it presents *too little* goodness. If the scripture doctrine be true that "the goodness of God leadeth to repentance," then we are in no danger of having too much of that motive to influence us. The great evil is, the world has had too limited views of the perfections of God, rather than too expansive. I can not see then, how Universalism, by presenting better views of God, can endanger the morals of society, and make men worse. Universalism, with all her lofty flight, is not permitted to gaze on all the glories of the divine character. There are beauties still infinitely beyond her reach. For "none by searching can find out God unto perfection." We should then be contented with the *best* view which God has seen fit to give to us of himself, and not fear that his goodness to us will make us more evil towards him. The question then ought to be settled—will not the goodness of God naturally incline us to be like him?

If I am now addressing a christian, let me ask that one, What first turned your feet from the paths of vice and ungodliness—and led you to love God and practice virtue? Was it any lack of mercy in God, or a partial goodness? Was it not rather a sense of God's subdu-

ing loveliness or overpowering goodness, as discovered to you in the daily blessings of his providence ; in his constant care over you, and more especially in the promises of his word, and that unbounded, untiring benevolence which seeks out the "*lost sheep*" and brings it home ? And did this view of the melting mercies of Heaven—this unmerited goodness in God, make you love sin more, or increase in you a desire to oppose all his precepts which he has delivered to you for your good ? You answer, no ; and with the poet you would sing :

" When all thy mercies, O my God,
My rising soul surveys,
Transported with the view, I'm lost,
In wonder, love, and praise."

Why then should you be afraid that these very motives which led you to love God and turned your feet into the paths of godliness, will lead others to hate God and practice wickedness ? To exhibit God in universal benevolence cannot corrupt the heart or make men malignant and disobedient. Love can never lead to deeds of evil. The more love we discover in God, the more we shall be inclined to love him. Or to use the language of John, "We love him because he first loved us." Look at the case of Peter and Paul. Were they made worse by a change of belief, or by being converted from their belief in a partial salvation to a belief that God was good unto all, both Jews and Gentiles,

and had included both nations in his covenant of salvation ? Rather did not the benevolence of their hearts expand in the same ratio with the increase of their faith in the impartial goodness of God ? Let the history of these worthy apostles answer.

Therefore, since love begets love, it is not possible for us to have too much love to influence us. And this being so, we should always strive to present that view of God and his purposes, which will excite in us the greatest love towards him. This, Universalism is directly calculated to do. It contains all the elements to make men good that wisdom could devise, or that can be found in any of the systems of doctrine which have been taught among men. It embodies all that is good and reformatory in them all, and will exert the most salutary influence when taught in its true simplicity and received into the understanding. If you can see great reason for loving God in his saving a part of the human family, there is still greater reason for loving God from the fact that he will save all men. Here your love expands as your faith increases. New beauties rise up for you to admire—new glories and increasing joys unfold themselves to invite your praise ; and blessings commensurate with the wants of universal man fill your soul with love, and constrain you to say, *we do indeed "love him because he first loved us,"* and because of "the GREAT love wherewith he hath loved us."—Here is Universalism. And here are its effects upon

the heart, when received into the heart and the understanding. See that man as he first steps upon the broad foundation of eternal and unlimited love!—how his bosom swells with heavenly emotions—he is surrounded with and breathes the untainted air of Heaven's changeless and limitless affection—and looking abroad upon the human family, he breaths forth the earnest, the feeling, and affectionate prayer for their eternal salvation. And can he seek to do an injury to any of God's creatures while he thus loves and prays for them—while he thus *feels* the very *spirit of Universalism* which gives him this love and inspires this prayer?—No, he can not—I repeat, *he can not*.

This then is the nature and effect of this doctrine, which is "peace on earth and good will to men." How then can we in duty to ourselves and our race, withhold a commendation of it from the serious consideration of mankind? We cannot do it without violating the holiest and plainest injunctions of Heaven. Hence, from this view of the doctrine here given, you will perceive :

Second. That it has claims also upon the consideration and support of man, from the fact that it is the only doctrine which can afford full satisfaction in the hour of death. What can afford sweet consolation in that hour "that tries men's souls?" Will the assurance that you and the dear objects of your love will part to meet no more? With almost annihilating power these words

would fall upon your ear—*part to meet no more!* And would you sing these words upon your death bed with exultation? Where is the mother, who, looking upon her sorrowing, weeping children, as they stand by her bed-side to receive the last parting kiss, could sing, "*we shall part to meet no more?*" O! the thought is withering to the soul, and beyond the power of endurance. There is no gospel comfort in it. But *assure* her, make her feel, and *understand*, that they shall meet again when life's trials and struggles are over, where tears are wiped from all faces, where groans, and sighs, and sickness, and death itself have come to a perpetual end, and unbounded joy fills the bosom of every child of God—and what is the marked result? She finds in the view rivers of consolation, and a hope beaming with the radiance of heaven. Limit this view, and the cup of her enjoyments is not full—there is a want yet unsatisfied. Leave one child, *one* only out of the kingdom, and her soul is in trouble. But when she can say,

We'll all rejoice,
No wanderer lost,

A FAMILY IN HEAVEN,

her soul is full—she asks no more—she wants no more. And when her spirit takes its flight to the upper world and arrives at the paradise of God, "the home of the soul"—she can rejoicingly say in the language of inspiration, "Behold I, and the *children* thou hast given me."

My dear fellow mortals, when we come to die,—when we lie down to take our exit from the scenes of time and those we love, we shall all need the consolation of this view, and the sustaining power of such a hope. Despise Universalism as much as you may, still, when you come to die, you will cling to her as the only true avenue through which full satisfaction can be obtained. What gives *any* satisfaction in the hour of death? Is it not the prospect of happiness, and happiness not only for ourselves, but also for our kindred? Surely. And what can throw over this prospect a brighter hope than the doctrine of universal holiness? None other under heaven. Hence many on their death bed have embraced this doctrine and died triumphing in the faith.

From this view now given, may I not say that this doctrine has some claims upon your love and confidence? or is it all a shadow, and “calculated only to please the carnal mind?” God knows that it does not descend to gratify the baser passions of man, but is in harmony with the holiest desires and loftiest aspirations of the human heart. It harmonizes with the religious element in our natures, and comes to elevate and improve it, by giving correct views of God and of our final home.

Third. This system has claims upon us from the consideration that those who believe it are the only people on earth who can consistently engage in the work of correcting *all* that is wrong. Supposing I believed that all evil will not be overcome: can I consistently engage in overcoming all evil? No, for the moment I begin to labor in that work, I begin to prove my faith false. Can I then be consistent while I strive to prove my faith true by argu-

ment, and labor to prove it false by my works? But say you, there is no danger of your proving it false in this way. But this view does not effect the argument, for if with my view I should labor to overcome all evil, and should be unsuccessful; still I should be equally inconsistent, for I should be aiding a work the accomplishment of which would be opposed to the truth, (if my belief be truth that all sin will not be overcome.) I cannot therefore see how any one can consistently engage in the work of correcting *all* that is wrong, unless he believes that work is right in the sight of God and agreeable with his truth. The Universalist, therefore, is the only man whose faith and works agree, or whose actions are consistent with his theory. Of all men on earth he has the greatest encouragement to labor in the cause of man's spiritual elevation and final purification, since he has God and truth on his side.

Fourth. This system has claims upon us from another consideration. *It is adapted to our social nature, and social relations.* It leads us to feel and cherish the sentiment of universal brotherhood, teaching us that "we have all one Father," and that if we wrong one of the human family, we wrong a brother. Therefore it teaches us to "be kind one to another"—to seek the good of all as we would seek our own good; because the good of all is identified with our own happiness. Though it has been said by Mr. Stearns, that "So far as this system has ever prevailed, it has uprooted the foundations of social order and happiness." What are "the foundations of social order and happiness?" I answer, love to God and man. Has Universalism uprooted this foundation? Never, neither can it, but on the con-

trary builds all its hopes upon and derives its only support from this foundation. Take this away and its practical existence ceases. It does not, like Phariseeism, step in and separate brothers from sisters, and parents from children, but more closely unites them in the bonds of social happiness, by inspiring them with exalted views of God's everlasting paternity, and pointing them to that happy home above, which we should all strive to imitate while on earth. But the view that others are in the sight of God not as good as ourselves, leads to persecution. This fact is clearly proved by the conduct of the Jews. "They esteemed themselves righteous and despised others." Believing that God did not consider the Gentiles as good as themselves, they hated and persecuted them. The same sentiment they cherished, will lead to the same results now, and consequently destroy all social friendship and union in society. But Universalism, on the contrary, by presenting an opposite view, or teaching that all are alike the objects of God's care and subjects of his favor, strengthens the social ties, and makes man, kind to his *brother man*. It teaches that since God is good unto all, and loves all impartially, man should imitate his heavenly Father, by loving and seeking the good of all. It exhibits a pattern in God which man in the performance of his social duties can imitate conscientiously. It would be sinful for us to love what God hates. If he love our neighbors and our enemies, we are bound to love them too, nor can we fully discharge our social duties without. Men are inclined to imitate the God they worship. If they believe him to be cruel, they will be cruel also. If he hate his enemies, they will feel justified in hating. If he

be partial, they will be. If he punish "without any direct reference to the good of the offender," as we are taught he will, then they will justify themselves in condemning heretics "to all the miseries of this life, to death itself, and the pains of hell forever." Hence in view of this fact, Lord Kaimes says, "That the Catholics burnt heretics over a slow fire of green wood, pleading in justification of their conduct, the fact, that God will burn them for ever in hell." And Tytler in his "Universal History" says, "It was a doctrine of Mary's, as Bishop Burnet informs us, that as the souls of heretics are afterwards to be eternally burning in hell, there could be nothing more proper than to imitate the divine vengeance by burning them on earth." And we are informed that in England alone, during her short reign, eight hundred fell victims to her sectarian cruelty by being burnt alive.

From all this it appears evident that the doctrine of Partialism and not of Universalism, has a direct tendency to call into *action, keep alive, and strengthen the worst passions* of our nature, and sap "the foundation of social order, and happiness." But Universalism, on the contrary, awakens all the better passions, by presenting God, the pattern of all perfection, before the mind's eye, in the light of Universal benevolence, of unchanging kindness and of imperishable goodness. All these characteristics make their most powerful and constant appeals to the benevolence and kindness of the human heart. It is a well attested fact, that the more we are familiar with scenes of cruelty and deeds of carnage and death, the harder become our hearts. Our characters are almost wholly moulded in the

images or examples that are before us. How important then that we should, in *doctrine* as well as in practice, present those things before men which will assimilate them to all that is best, and holiest, and purest in heaven. Here again, we are happy to say that Universalism is, of all systems ever taught, the most happily adapted to this end. Let me therefore never forsake it, or lose sight of its beauties, but be transformed by it, into its own likeness. For it is neither cruel nor selfish—it does not confine its duties and its appeals to a select few, but looks out upon the broad universe of intelligences as the offspring of one Father, and as such are bound together by social ties which can never be sundered with impunity. It teaches me that my interest consists in promoting the best interest of others—that the precepts of the gospel are binding upon all men, as its *doctrines* are adapted to the *wants* of all men. Hence Dr. Wayland has very justly remarked, “That not only is it for the interest of every man, that his fellow men should obey the precepts of the gospel, it is also for the interest of every nation that every other nation should obey them. *So thoroughly is universal philanthropy interwoven with the social system of this world. Thus clearly has God made the happiness of my fellow men, necessary to my own.*”

Fifth. This doctrine is, accordingly, destined to triumph and reign, when all other systems of faith are passed away and are forgotten. It possesses intrinsically the properties of its own triumphant perpetuation. It reaches onward and upward, and never ceases its aspirations and its holy achievements till the signet of everlasting life is set on the heart of all, and the banner of universal victory waves in

triumph over a world redeemed. It is mysteriously interweaving itself into all the religious, scientific and civil improvements of the age, and is gradually yet permanently moulding the mass into its own likeness. The law of kindness, which we have so long urged upon the world instead of that of retaliation, is now being the universal law. Our prison discipline has caught its spirit, and it has found its way into our schools of learning—into our social compact—into family and national governments; so that instead of ruling with the rod and fear, the great and prevailing law now is to rule with love and kindness, in imitation of the great Teacher of Israel; so that it is not now so much the aim of men to *punish*, as it is to *reform*. All this change has been keeping pace and running parallel with the advancing step of Universalism. It is now irresistibly at work in preparing the mind to banish out of existence that barbarous relic of the dark ages—the act of choking men to death according to law. It has awakened in man more vigorously the love of human freedom and of equal rights, so that now if any thing enslaves the body or mind, or exhibits “man’s inhumanity to man,” the affections are aroused and call for liberty. *Nor will this call cease while there is a heart to feel, or a soul to be redeemed.*

Hence, the obvious tendency of the age, is to the spirit of Universalism. This fact is admitted even by our opposers. The New York Observer says, “The so-called evangelical religion of England and of Europe, is infected, to an alarming extent, with a *tendency to Universalism.*” It is extending itself rapidly in this our own country. And while nearly all other religions are going down, down to—

wards the verge of extinction ; Universalism is going onward and upward—upward she gazes and upward she takes her ardent flight. If then the kingdom of Christ is a progressive and growing kingdom, Universalism is the only doctrine consistent with its nature. The prophet Isaiah, 9: 7, said “Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.” This government or kingdom and its consequent peace, can not be promoted without the acknowledgment of a universal Deity and universal love.—Having this foundation to rest upon, it *must prosper*, and the best wishes of the world will be uttered in its behalf.—The prayers of all devout men and angels will continue to ascend to God for it. If our hearts are touched with the spirit of God’s universal benevolence, we shall continue to wish and *labor* for its prosperity, because such labor is consistent with our wish and belief. As says Dr. Benjamin Rush, “At present we wish liberty to the whole world—but the next touch of the celestial magnet upon the human heart will direct it into wishes for the *salvation of all mankind*.” May the “celestial magnet of God’s unchanging and universal love touch all our hearts and attract us to him, as the needle is attracted by the magnet, that we may still continue to hope, and pray, and labor in view of this blessed end, “Till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man.” Eph. 4: 13.





~~AUG 31 1982~~

~~SEP 30 1982~~

BX9947.57R6

Antidote analyzed :

Andover-Harvard

000000257



3 2044 077 892 255

